arXiv:1509.09056v1 [hep-th] 30 Sep 2015

Hyperinstantons, the Beltrami Equation, and Triholomorphic Maps

P. Fré [a,d,1], P.A. Grassi [b], and A.S. Sorin [c,d]

[a] *Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Torino*
INFN – Sezione di Torino
via P. Giuria 1, 10125 Torino Italy
e-mail: fre@to.infn.it

[b] *Dipartimento di Scienze e Innovazione Tecnologica,*
Viale T. Michel 11, 15121 Alessandria, Italy Università del Piemonte Orientale,
and INFN Sezione di Torino
e-mail: pietro.grassi@uniupo.it

[c] *Bogoliubov Laboratory of Theoretical Physics and*
Veksler and Baldin Laboratory of High Energy Physics
Joint Institute for Nuclear Research,
141980 Dubna, Moscow Region, Russia
e-mail: sorin@theor.jinr.ru

[d] *National Research Nuclear University MEPhI*
(Moscow Engineering Physics Institute),
Kashirskoye shosse 31, 115409 Moscow, Russia

Abstract

We consider the Beltrami equation for hydrodynamics and we show that its solutions can be viewed as instanton solutions of a more general system of equations. The latter are the equations of motion for an $\mathcal{N} = 2$ sigma model on 4-dimensional worldvolume (which is taken locally HyperKähler) with a 4-dimensional HyperKähler target space. By means of the 4D twisting procedure originally introduced by Witten for gauge theories and later generalized to 4D sigma-models by Anselmi and Fré, we show that the equations of motion describe triholomophic maps between the worldvolume and the target space. Therefore, the classification of the solutions to the 3-dimensional Beltrami equation can be performed by counting the triholomorphic maps. The counting is easily obtained by using several discrete symmetries. Finally, the similarity with holomorphic maps for $\mathcal{N} = 2$ sigma on Calabi-Yau space prompts us to reformulate the problem of the enumeration of triholomorphic maps in terms of a topological sigma model.

[1] Prof. Fré is presently fulfilling the duties of Scientific Counselor of the Italian Embassy in the Russian Federation, Denezhnij pereulok, 5, 121002 Moscow, Russia. *e-mail:* pietro.fre@esteri.it

Contents

1 Introduction **2**

2 HyperKähler Geometry **4**
2.1 The flat $SU(2)_I$-bundle and holonomy 4
2.2 The $SU(2)_Q$-bundle and reduced holonomy 6
2.2.1 Gamma matrices 7
2.3 Flat HyperKähler Geometry in $d = 4$ 7

3 The $\mathcal{N} = 2$ sigma-model in $D = 4$ and its topological twist **10**
3.1 Detailed derivation of the topological twist 13

4 Triholomorphic hyperinstantons and Beltrami vector fields **16**
4.1 The standard Fourier expansion on T^3 and the condition of triholomorphicity 19
4.2 The hyperinstanton functional space and octahedral orbits in the momentum lattice . 21
4.3 The role of the Universal Classifying Group G_{1536} 25

5 The coupling constants in the topological action and their geometry **27**

6 Moduli space of the hyperinstantons, boundary conditions and the BRST complex **29**
6.1 Boundary conditions on the ghost fields 31

7 Summary and Conclusions **32**

A Complex structure of the hyperinstantons **34**

B About the coset $SO(3,3)/SO(3) \times SO(3)$ **36**
B.1 The $SO(3,3) \sim SL(4,R)$ isomorphism, flat metrics and HyperKähler structures 36
B.2 The solvable parameterization and fractional linear transformations 37
B.3 The off-diagonal parameterization 41

C Some large formulas **42**

1 Introduction

In a recent paper [1], two of us proposed what they described as a *Sentimental Journey from Hydrodynamics to Supergravity*, namely a reinterpretation of the solutions of Beltrami equation as fluxes in 2-brane exact solutions of $D = 7$ minimal supergravity [2],[3],[4]. In the same jocose spirit we can describe the present paper as a *Sentimental Journey from Hydrodynamics to Hyperinstantons*, since we show hereby that the solutions of Beltrami equation can be mapped into solutions of the *triholomorphicity constraint* that defines the hyperinstantons, namely the instanton solutions of an $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetric sigma model in D=4.

Hence let us briefly recall the two sides of the correspondence which we plan to demonstrate.

The first side is a simple first order differential equation written in the XIX century by the great Italian Mathematician Eugenio Beltrami[5]: an equation that bears his name and can be cast in the following modern notation:

$$\star_g \, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{Y}_{[1]} \;\; = \;\; \mu \, \mathbf{Y}_{[1]} \tag{1.1}$$

The unknown in this equation is a 1-form $\mathbf{Y}_{[1]} = \mathbf{Y}_i dx^i$. The symbol $\star_g$ denotes the Hodge dual on a 3-dimensional manifold. Indeed eq.(1.1) is an eigenvalue problem which makes sense only on three-manifolds $\mathcal{M}_3$. If $\mathcal{M}_3$ is compact, the spectrum of the $\star\,\mathrm{d}$ operator is discrete and encodes topological properties of the manifold. In particular if $\mathcal{M}_3$ is a flat torus T^3, the whole spectrum of eigenvalues and eigenfunctions can be constructed with simple algorithms and it can be organized into irreducible representations of a rich variety of crystallographic groups that were recently explored and classified by two of us [6]. The hydrodynamical viewpoint on eq.(1.1) arises from the trivial observation that a 1-form $\mathbf{Y}_{[1]}$ is dual to a vector field $\vec{\mathbf{V}}$ and that any vector field in three-dimensions can be interpreted as the velocity field of some fluid. This hydrodynamical interpretation of eq.(1.1) is boosted by the existence of a very important theorem proved by V. Arnold [7]: *on compact manifolds $\mathcal{M}_3$, streamlines of a steady flow have a chance of displaying a chaotic behavior if and only if the one-form dual to the vector-field of the flow satisfies Beltrami equation.* See on this point also [8],[9]

In order to approach the second side of the correspondence we aim to analyse, let us stress that (1.1) is the three dimensional counterpart of the (anti) self-duality condition for 4-dimensional instantons in a gauge field theory. For a diagonal metric, it can be written as

$$\frac{1}{2}\,\epsilon_{ijk}\partial_j \mathbf{Y}_k \;=\; \mu\,\mathbf{Y}_i\,. \tag{1.2}$$

which implies $\partial^i \mathbf{Y}_i = 0$ if $\mu \neq 0$.

If we embed a solution to (1.1) into a four dimensional manifold by adding a further component $\mathbf{Y}_0$ to the 1-form $\mathbf{Y}_{[1]}$ with a corresponding new coordinate U, we can rewrite Beltrami equation as follows

$$d \star_g \mathbf{q}_{[1]} = 0\,, \qquad (1 + \star_g)\, d\mathbf{q}_{[1]} = 0 \tag{1.3}$$

where $\mathbf{q}_{[1]}$ is a 1-form on a four dimensional manifold and $\star_g$ is the Hodge dual on that manifold. This set of equations were studied in [10]. Its authors showed that these equations can be rephrased

as *triholomorphic* maps from a flat 4-dimensional HyperKähler manifold to another HyperKälher. In particular, if we consider the components $\mathbf{q}_s$ (with $s = 0, \ldots, 3$) as maps

$$q : \mathcal{M}_4 \to \mathcal{N}_4$$

from a four dimensional flat HyperKähler (worldvolume) manifold $\mathcal{M}_4$ to a (target) HyperKähler manifold $\mathcal{N}_4$, the equations (1.3) are equivalent to

$$q^\star - J_x \circ q^\star \circ j_x = 0. \tag{1.4}$$

where $q^\star$ are the push-forward $T\mathcal{M}_4 \to T\mathcal{N}_4$ and j^x and J^x (with $x = 1, .., 3$) are the three complex structures of $\mathcal{M}_4$ and of $\mathcal{N}_4$, respectively. In the present paper we consider a $4d$ topological σ-model as a theory of those maps. The precise form of our topological field theory is obtained from the topological twist of an $\mathcal{N} = 2$ σ-model. It can be easily generalized to $4m$-dimensional target space $\mathcal{N}_{4m}$ as discussed in the text.

As we will recall in a later section, eq. (1.4) arises uniquely from the topological twist of an $\mathcal{N} = 2$ sigma-model in $D = 4$ and it was proposed by Anselmi and Fré in [10] as the correct *triholomorphicity* generalization of the *holomorphicity constraint*:

$$X^\star \; - \; J \circ X^\star \circ j = 0. \tag{1.5}$$

satisfied by a holomorphic map $X : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{N}$ from a complex manifold $\mathcal{M}$ to a complex manifold $\mathcal{N}$. Actually in [10] it was noted that the definition (1.4) might be slightly generalized since there is no uniqueness of the relative ordering of the three complex structures of the two manifolds. It was proposed that eq. (1.4) might be substituted with the more general condition

$$q^\star - \mathrm{O}^{xy} J_x \circ q^\star \circ j_y = 0, \tag{1.6}$$

where O^{xy} is an SO(3) matrix that can depend on the point. According to this weaker definition, *triholomorphic maps* are those maps q for which there exists a O^{xy} such that (1.6) holds.

Indeed the matrix O^{xy} is nothing else but a transition function of the SU(2) bundle $\mathcal{SU}_{\mathrm{I}}$ associated with the triplet of Kähler 2-forms that define the HyperKähler geometry. In the case of HyperKähler geometry, $\mathcal{SU}_{\mathrm{I}}$ is a flat bundle and the transition functions O^{xy} are necessarily constant.

Once we have recognised that the triholomoprhic maps are in correspondence with the solutions of the Beltrami equation, we construct those maps and we classify them according to the discrete group studied in the previous papers of the subject. In particular, we construct several triholomorphic maps characterised by the quantum number of the representation theory for the octhaedral group O_{24}. In terms of those solutions, we analyze the topological action, which reduces to the topological term, and we show how to disentangle the moduli of the solution from the rest. In particular, we demonstrate the BRST symmetry of the action due to the boundary conditions on the ghost fields evaluated on the triholomorphic maps.

The paper is organized as follows. In sec. 2 we recall some basic ingrdients on HyperKälher geometry, notations and the two SU(2) bundles over the space needed to perform the twisting procedure. In sec. 2.3 we discuss flat HyperKälher geometry and we introduce the fundamental notations

we are using in the rest of the paper. In sec. 3, we discuss N=2 sigma model in four dimensions and its topological twist. On the latter part we insist to provide a complete and a self-contained discussion. In sec. 4 we discuss the relation among triholomorphic maps, Beltrami vector fields and hyperinstantons. The explicit expressions of the solution to the triholomorphic equation is given and the classification of the solution is performed by using the discrete groups discussed in the previous literature [6]. In sec. 5, the coupling constants are discussed and in sec. 6 the moduli space is constructed. We discuss in detail the action, the functional integral and the boundary conditions for the ghost fields (twisted fermions). In the appendix we recall some properties of triholomorphic hyperinstantons and other auxilliary material.

2 HyperKähler Geometry

Here we summarize the concepts and the definitions of HyperKähler geometry following [11].

A HyperKähler manifold $\mathcal{HM}$ is a $4m$-dimensional real manifold endowed with a metric h:

$$ds^2 = h_{uv}(q)dq^u \otimes dq^v \quad ; \quad u, v = 1, \ldots, 4m \tag{2.1}$$

and three complex structures

$$(J^x) \; : \; T(\mathcal{HM}) \longrightarrow T(\mathcal{HM}) \qquad (x = 1, 2, 3) \tag{2.2}$$

that satisfy the quaternionic algebra

$$J^x J^y = -\delta^{xy} \mathbb{1} + \epsilon^{xyz} J^z \tag{2.3}$$

and respect to which the metric is hermitian:

$$\forall \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y} \in T\mathcal{HM} \; : \quad h\left(J^x \mathbf{X}, J^x \mathbf{Y}\right) = h\left(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}\right) \qquad (x = 1, 2, 3) \tag{2.4}$$

From eq. (2.4) it follows that one can introduce a triplet of 2-forms

$$\mathbf{K}^x \;=\; K^x_{uv} dq^u \wedge dq^v \;\; ; \;\; K^x_{uv} \;=\; h_{uw}(J^x)^w_v \tag{2.5}$$

The triplet $\mathbf{K}^x$ is named the *HyperKähler* form: it is an SU(2) Lie–algebra valued 2–form.

2.1 The flat $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{I}}$-bundle and holonomy

Let us introduce a principal SU(2)–bundle

$$\mathcal{SU}_{\mathrm{I}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{HM} \tag{2.6}$$

and let ω^x denote a flat connection on such a bundle:

$$d\omega^x + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{xyz}\omega^y \wedge \omega^z \;=\; 0 \tag{2.7}$$

The definition of a HyperKähler manifold requires that the HyperKähler 2–form $\mathbf{K}^x$ should be covariantly closed with respect to the flat connection ω^x:

$$\nabla\mathbf{K}^x \equiv \mathrm{d}\mathbf{K}^x + \epsilon^{xyz}\omega^y \wedge \mathbf{K}^z \;=\; 0 \tag{2.8}$$

In any local patch of the bundle the flat-connection ω^y can be reduced to zero and in that patch the HyperKähler form is closed $d\mathbf{K}^x = 0$. The structural group of the above mentioned flat bundle of which the HyperKähler 2-forms constitute a section is named $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{I}}$. It plays an important role in supersymmetry since in the construction of a $\mathcal{N} = 2$ sigma-model it is identified with the SU(2)-automorphism group of the supersymmetry algebra.

As a consequence of the above structure the HyperKähler manifold $\mathcal{HM}$ has a holonomy group of the following type:

$$\mathrm{Hol}(\mathcal{HM}) \;\; = \;\; \mathbb{1} \otimes \mathcal{H} \;\; ; \;\; \mathcal{H} \subset \mathrm{USp}(2m) \tag{2.9}$$

Introducing flat indices $\{A, B, C = 1, 2\}, \{\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}, \mathcal{K} = 1, .., 2m\}$ that run, respectively, in the fundamental representations of $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{I}}$ and USp(2m) (we denote by $\mathfrak{su}(2)_{\mathrm{I}}, \mathfrak{usp}(2\mathrm{m})$ the corresponding Lie algebras), we can find a complex vielbein 1-form

$$\mathcal{U}^{A\mathcal{I}} = \mathcal{U}^{A\mathcal{I}}_u(q)dq^u \tag{2.10}$$

such that

$$h_{uv} = \mathcal{U}^{A\mathcal{I}}_u\mathcal{U}^{B\mathcal{J}}_v\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{J}}\epsilon_{AB} \tag{2.11}$$

where $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{J}} = -\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{J}\mathcal{I}}$ and $\epsilon_{AB} = -\epsilon_{BA}$ are, respectively, the flat USp(2m) and $\mathrm{USp}(2) \sim \mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{I}}$ invariant metrics. The vielbein $\mathcal{U}^{A\mathcal{I}}$ is covariantly closed with respect to the flat $\mathfrak{su}(2)_{\mathrm{I}}$-connection ω^z and to some $\mathfrak{usp}(2\mathrm{m})$-Lie Algebra valued connection $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{J}} = \Delta^{\mathcal{J}\mathcal{I}}$:

$$\nabla\mathcal{U}^{A\mathcal{I}} \;\; \equiv \;\; d\mathcal{U}^{A\mathcal{I}} + \frac{i}{2}\omega^x(\epsilon\sigma_x\epsilon^{-1})^A{}_B \wedge \mathcal{U}^{B\mathcal{I}} + \Delta^{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{J}} \wedge \mathcal{U}^{A\mathcal{K}}\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{J}\mathcal{K}} = 0 \tag{2.12}$$

where $(\sigma^x)_A{}^B$ are the standard Pauli matrices. Furthermore $\mathcal{U}^{A\mathcal{I}}$ satisfies the reality condition:

$$\mathcal{U}_{A\mathcal{I}} \equiv (\mathcal{U}^{A\mathcal{I}})^* = \epsilon_{AB}\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{J}}\mathcal{U}^{B\mathcal{J}} \tag{2.13}$$

We have also the inverse vielbein $\mathcal{U}^u_{A\mathcal{I}}$ defined by the equation

$$\mathcal{U}^u_{A\mathcal{I}}\mathcal{U}^{A\mathcal{I}}_v = \delta^u_v \tag{2.14}$$

Flattening a pair of indices of the Riemann tensor $\mathcal{R}^{uv}{}_{ts}$ we obtain

$$\mathcal{R}^{uv}{}_{ts}\mathcal{U}^{\mathcal{I}A}_u\mathcal{U}^{\mathcal{J}B}_v = \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{J}}_{ts}\epsilon^{AB} \tag{2.15}$$

where $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{J}}_{ts}$ is the field strength of the $\mathfrak{usp}(2\mathrm{m})$-connection:

$$\mathrm{d}\Delta^{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{J}} + \Delta^{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{K}} \wedge \Delta^{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{J}}\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{K}\mathcal{L}} \equiv \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{J}} = \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{J}}_{ts}dq^t \wedge dq^s \tag{2.16}$$

Eq. (2.15) is the explicit statement that the Levi Civita connection associated with the metric h has a holonomy group contained in $\mathbf{1} \otimes \mathrm{USp}(2\mathrm{m})$. Finally we have the following relation between the HyperKähler form and the complex vielbein

$$\mathbf{K}^x = -\mathrm{i}\,\tfrac{1}{2}\,(\sigma_x)_A{}^C\,\mathcal{U}^{\mathcal{I}A} \wedge \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{I}C} \tag{2.17}$$

From equation (2.17) one easily retrieves the following useful identity:

$$\mathrm{i}\,\sigma^x_{AB}\,\mathcal{U}^{B\mathcal{I}}_u = \epsilon_{AB}\,J^{x|v}_u\,\mathcal{U}^{B\mathcal{I}}_v \tag{2.18}$$

The above equation has the following clearcut geometrical interpretation. The action of the quaternionic tensors on the tangent bundle can always be compensated by a transformation in the $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{I}}$-fiber of the SU_{I}-bundle.

2.2 The $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{Q}}$-bundle and reduced holonomy

Besides $\mathcal{SU}_I$ there is a second SU(2) principal bundle defined by HyperKähler geometry, which is not necessarily flat. This bundle naturally arises from the simple algebraic consideration that there exists the following universal subalgebra:

$$\mathfrak{su}(2)_{\mathrm{Q}} \oplus \mathfrak{so}(\mathrm{m}) \subset \mathfrak{usp}(2\mathrm{m}) \tag{2.19}$$

of the compact symplectic algebra. The procedure of the topological twist is well defined for those HyperKähler target manifolds $\mathcal{N}_{4m}$ where the holonomy is further reduced[2] with respect to eq.(2.9), namely where we have:

$$\mathrm{Hol}(\mathcal{N}_{4m}) \;=\; \mathbb{1} \otimes \mathcal{H} \quad ; \quad \mathcal{H} \subset \mathfrak{su}(2)_{\mathrm{Q}} \oplus \mathfrak{so}(\mathrm{m}) \tag{2.20}$$

When the condition (2.20) is realized, we can use a refined index notation. The indices $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}, \mathcal{K}, \ldots$ taking $2m$-values can be substituted by pairs of indices $(\dot{A}, k), (\dot{B}, h), (\dot{C}, \ell), \ldots$ where $\dot{A}, \dot{B}, \dot{C}, \ldots = \dot{1}, \dot{2}$ span the fundamental representation of $\mathfrak{su}(2)_{\mathrm{Q}}$, while $k, h, \ell, \ldots = 1, 2, 3, \ldots$ span the fundamental representation of $\mathfrak{so}(\mathrm{m})$. In this way the complex vielbein can be rewritten as follows:

$$\mathcal{U}^{A\mathcal{I}}_u = \mathcal{U}_{u|a}{}^{A}{}_{\dot{B}} \quad ; \quad \mathcal{U}_{u|A\mathcal{I}} = \mathcal{U}_{u|aA}{}^{\dot{B}} \tag{2.21}$$

and the symplectic metric $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{J}}$ becomes:

$$\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{J}} = \epsilon^{\dot{A}\dot{B}}\,\delta_{hk} \quad ; \quad \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{J}} = \epsilon_{\dot{A}\dot{B}}\,\delta_{hk} \tag{2.22}$$

Equation (2.21) admits a further rewriting which is very important at the level of the topological twist. Indeed, using the quaternionic basis matrices (2.30) discussed in next section we can set:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}_k{}^{A}{}_{\dot{B}} \equiv \mathcal{U}_{u|k}{}^{A}{}_{\dot{B}}\,\mathrm{d}q^u &= (e_\mu)^A{}_{\dot{B}}\;E^\mu_{u|k}\,\mathrm{d}q^u \equiv (e_\mu)^A{}_{\dot{B}}\;\mathbf{E}^\mu_k \\ \mathcal{U}_{kA}{}^{\dot{B}} \equiv \mathcal{U}_{u|kA}{}^{\dot{B}}\,\mathrm{d}q^u &= \left(e^\dagger_\mu\right)_A{}^{\dot{B}}\;E^\mu_{u|k}\,\mathrm{d}q^u \equiv \left(e^\dagger_\mu\right)_A{}^{\dot{B}}\;\mathbf{E}^\mu_k \end{aligned} \tag{2.23}$$

[2]This reduction of holonomy was implicitly assumed in the construction of [10] but was not explicitly spelled out in that paper. This is very important, since it provides a clear geometrical interpretation of the topological twist as a basis for the introduction of hyperinstanton equations.

where:

$$\mathbf{E}_k^\mu \;=\; E_{u|k}^\mu \, \mathrm{d}q^u \tag{2.24}$$

is a real vielbein 1-form transforming in the bi–fundamental representation of $\mathfrak{so}(4)_{\rm IQ} \oplus \mathfrak{so}(\mathrm{m})$, the algebra $\mathfrak{so}(4)_{\rm IQ}$ being defined as follows:

$$\mathfrak{so}(4)_{\rm IQ} \;\equiv\; \mathfrak{su}(2)_{\rm I} \oplus \mathfrak{su}(2)_{\rm Q} \tag{2.25}$$

As we discuss below in section 3, the geometrical basis of the topological twist is the identification of the group $\mathfrak{so}(4)_{\rm IQ}$ with the euclidianized Lorentz group $\mathfrak{so}(4)_{\rm Lorentz}$. In order to be able to do such an identification the existence of $\mathfrak{so}(4)_{\rm IQ}$ is obviously necessary and the condition for its existence is the reduced holonomy (2.20) of the target HyperKähler manifold $\mathcal{N}_{4m}$.

One further identity which will be quite useful for the topological twist is the following one:

$$\tfrac{1}{2}\,\mathrm{Tr}\left[e_\mu^\dagger \, e_\nu \, e_x\right] \;=\; J_{\mu\nu}^{+|x} \quad ; \quad x \;=\; 1,2,3 \quad ; \quad \mu,\nu \;=\; 0,1,2,3 \tag{2.26}$$

In the above equation, $J_{\mu\nu}^{+|x}$ denotes the self-dual matrices discussed in next section.

2.2.1 Gamma matrices

Before proceeding further it is also convenient to fix a well adapted basis of $\mathfrak{so}(4)$-gamma matrices that we will use in dealing with the topological twist of the $\mathcal{N}=2$ sigma-model. We utilize a chiral basis in which the matrix γ_5 is block diagonal. We set:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_0 &= \sigma_1 \otimes \mathbf{1}_{2\times 2} \\ \gamma_x &= \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_x \quad (x =, 1,2,3) \\ \gamma_5 &= \sigma_3 \otimes \mathbf{1}_{2\times 2} \end{aligned} \tag{2.27}$$

In this way we obtain that:

$$\gamma_\mu \;=\; \left(\begin{array}{c|c} 0 & e_\mu^\dagger \\ \hline e_\mu & 0 \end{array}\right) \quad \mu \;=\; 0,1,2,3 \tag{2.28}$$

2.3 Flat HyperKähler Geometry in $d = 4$

In the present subsection we analyse the specific form of a flat four dimensional HyperKähler manifold $\mathcal{HK}_4$. We begin first by discussing its universal local geometry, then we discuss the choices of its global structure that are relevant to our purposes.

Considering the standard Pauli matrices:

$$\sigma_1 \;=\; \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad ; \quad \sigma_2 \;=\; \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad ; \quad \sigma_3 \;=\; \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \tag{2.29}$$

let us define the quaternionic basis as follows:

$$e_0 \,=\, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad ; \quad e_x \,=\, \mathrm{i}\,\sigma_x \quad (x=1,2,3) \tag{2.30}$$

and let us introduce the 't Hooft matrices, namely two sets of 4×4 antisymmetric matrices that represent the quaternionic algebra (2.3) and are respectively self–dual and antiself–dual:

$$J^{+|1} \,=\, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad J^{+|2} \,=\, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad J^{+|3} \,=\, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{2.31}$$

$$J^{-|1} \,=\, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad J^{-|2} \,=\, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad J^{-|3} \,=\, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{2.32}$$

$$J^{\pm|x}_{ab} \,=\, \pm\,\tfrac{1}{2}\,\epsilon_{abcd}\,J^{\pm|x}_{cd} \tag{2.33}$$

The matrices $J^{\pm|x}$ satisfy the $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ Lie algebra and commute among themselves:

$$\left[J^{\pm|x}\,,\,J^{\pm|y}\right] \,=\, 2\,\epsilon_{xyz}\,J^{\pm|z} \quad ; \quad \left[J^{\pm|x}\,,\,J^{\mp|y}\right] \,=\, 0 \tag{2.34}$$

Together the six generators $J^{\pm|x}$ span the $\mathfrak{so}(4)$ Lie algebra and correspond to its decomposition:

$$\mathfrak{so}(4) \,=\, \mathfrak{su}(2)_{\mathrm{L}} \oplus \mathfrak{su}(2)_{\mathrm{R}} \tag{2.35}$$

Given these conventions we name

$$q^u \,=\, \{\mathrm{U},\mathrm{X},\mathrm{Y},\mathrm{Z}\} \tag{2.36}$$

the four real coordinates of the flat HyperKähler manifold and we introduce the quaternionic coordinate $\mathcal{Q}$ and the complex vielbein as it follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q} \;&\equiv\; \mathrm{U}\,e_0 \,+\, \mathrm{X}\,\epsilon_1 \,+\, \mathrm{Y}\,e_2 \,+\, \mathrm{Z}\,e_3 \,=\, \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{U}+i\mathrm{Z} & i\mathrm{X}+\mathrm{Y} \\ i\mathrm{X}-\mathrm{Y} & \mathrm{U}-i\mathrm{Z} \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathcal{U} \,\equiv\, \mathrm{d}\mathcal{Q} \,=\, \mathcal{U}^{A\mathcal{I}} \;&=\; \mathrm{dU}\,e_0 \,+\, \mathrm{dX}\,\epsilon_1 \,+\, \mathrm{dY}\,e_2 \,+\, \mathrm{dZ}\,e_3 \,=\, \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{dU}+i\mathrm{dZ} & i\mathrm{dX}+\mathrm{dY} \\ i\mathrm{dX}-\mathrm{dY} & \mathrm{dU}-i\mathrm{dZ} \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \tag{2.37}$$

Then according to formula (2.17) we get:

$$\mathbf{K}^x \,=\, -\,\mathrm{i}\tfrac{1}{2}\,\mathrm{Tr}\,\left[\mathcal{U}^T \wedge \sigma^x\,\mathcal{U}^\star\right] \,=\, \mathbf{K}^x_{[-]} \,\equiv\, J^{-|x}_{uv}\,dq^u \wedge dq^v \tag{2.38}$$

By explicit substitution we obtain:

$$\mathbf{K}^1_{[-]} \,=\, 2\mathrm{dY}\wedge\mathrm{dZ}-2\mathrm{dU}\wedge\mathrm{dX} \quad ; \quad \mathbf{K}^2_{[-]} \,=\, 2\mathrm{dU}\wedge\mathrm{dY}+2\mathrm{dX}\wedge\mathrm{dZ} \quad ; \quad \mathbf{K}^3_{[-]} \,=\, 2\mathrm{dX}\wedge\mathrm{dY}-2\mathrm{dU}\wedge\mathrm{dZ} \tag{2.39}$$

On the other hand the metric h has the following explicit appearance:

$$ds^2 \,=\, h_{uv}\, dq^u \otimes dq^v \,=\, \mathrm{dU}^2 \,+\, \mathrm{dX}^2 \,+\, \mathrm{dY}^2 \,+\, \mathrm{dZ}^2 \tag{2.40}$$

In addition to the HyperKähler 2-forms mentioned in (2.41) we have three self-dual 2-forms:

$$\mathbf{K}^1_{[+]} \,=\, 2\mathrm{dY}\wedge\mathrm{dZ}+2\mathrm{dU}\wedge\mathrm{dX} \quad ; \quad \mathbf{K}^2_{[+]} \,=\, -\,2\mathrm{dU}\wedge\mathrm{dY}+2\mathrm{dX}\wedge\mathrm{dZ} \quad ; \quad \mathbf{K}^3_{[+]} \,=\, -\,2\mathrm{dX}\wedge\mathrm{dY}-2\mathrm{dU}\wedge\mathrm{dZ} \tag{2.41}$$

Altogether we can arrange the 6 two-forms $\mathbf{K}^x_{[\mp]}$ into a 6-vector:

$$\alpha^I = \left\{ \underbrace{\mathbf{K}^1_{[-]}, \mathbf{K}^2_{[-]}, \mathbf{K}^3_{[-]}}_{I=1,2,3}, \underbrace{\mathbf{K}^1_{[+]}, \mathbf{K}^2_{[+]}, \mathbf{K}^3_{[+]}}_{I=\dot{1},\dot{2},\dot{3}} \right\} \tag{2.42}$$

with the properties:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha^I \wedge \alpha^J &= 8\,\eta^{IJ}\,\mathrm{Vol} \\ \mathrm{Vol} &= \mathrm{dU}\wedge\mathrm{dX}\wedge\mathrm{dY}\wedge\mathrm{dZ} \end{aligned} \tag{2.43}$$

where the *intersection matrix* is:

$$\eta^{IJ} \,=\, \left(\begin{array}{c|c} -\,\mathbf{1}_{3\times3} & \mathbf{0}_{3\times3} \\ \hline \mathbf{0}_{3\times3} & \mathbf{1}_{3\times3} \end{array}\right) \tag{2.44}$$

The group of linear transformations in the basis of 2-forms α^I which preserves the intersection matrix and hence the cohomology lattice is $\mathfrak{so}(3,3)$. This will be relevant in the discussion of the lagrangian moduli.

We also need the boundary conditions to define the global topological structure of $\mathcal{HK}_4$. In the sequel we consider two cases

$$\mathcal{HK}_4 \,=\, \mathcal{M}_4 \,\equiv\, \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathrm{T}^3 \quad ; \quad \mathcal{HK}_4 \,=\, \mathcal{N}_4 \,\equiv\, \mathbb{R}^4 \tag{2.45}$$

the first choice being utilized as the base manifold, the second as the target manifold in the topological sigma-model. Both the manifold $\mathcal{M}_4$ and $\mathcal{N}_4$ are non compact, yet there is a fundamental difference, the base manifold has a boundary $\partial\mathcal{M}_4 \,\simeq\, \mathrm{T}^3$ corresponding to $\mathrm{U}=0$, while $\mathcal{N}_4$ has no boundary.

In practice we obtain the first manifold $\mathcal{M}_4$ by means of the following conditions:

$$\mathrm{U} \;\in\; [0,\infty) \tag{2.46}$$

$$\{\mathrm{X},\mathrm{Y},\mathrm{Z}\} \;\simeq\; \{\mathrm{X},\mathrm{Y},\mathrm{Z}\}+\{n,m,r\} \quad ; \quad n,m,r\in\mathbb{Z} \tag{2.47}$$

The second manifold $\mathcal{N}_4$ is obtained in the usual way assuming:

$$\mathrm{q}^u \;\in\; (-\infty,\infty) \quad ; \quad u = 0,1,2,3 \tag{2.48}$$

where, in order to distinguish them from the coordinates of the base manifold $\mathcal{M}_4$, we have renamed the coordinates of the target manifold $\mathcal{N}_4$ as it follows:

$$\mathrm{U} \mapsto \mathrm{q}^0 \quad ; \quad \mathrm{X} \mapsto \mathrm{q}^1 \quad ; \qquad \mathrm{Y} \mapsto \mathrm{q}^2; \qquad \mathrm{Z} \mapsto \mathrm{q}^3 \tag{2.49}$$

3 The $\mathcal{N} = 2$ sigma-model in $D = 4$ and its topological twist

In this section, following once again [11] and [10] we present the general form of a rigid $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetric sigma-model in $D = 4$ and we perform its topological twist according to the $4D$-algorithm developed by Anselmi and Fré in [12],[13],[14].

Given the base flat manifold $\mathcal{M}_4$, which has always a local HyperKähler structure, supersymmetry requires that the target manifold should be a HyperKähler manifold $\mathcal{N}_{4m}$ of real dimension 4m. The field content of this theory is provided by the $4m$ scalar fields q^u and by two chiral spin one-half fields, the hyperini $\gamma_5\,\zeta_{\mathcal{I}} = \zeta_{\mathcal{I}}$ and $\gamma_5\,\zeta^{\mathcal{I}} = -\zeta^{\mathcal{I}}$ that transform respectively in the **2m** and $\overline{\mathbf{2m}}$ representations of the holonomy group USp(2m).

Utilizing the geometric structures that we have introduced in section 2, the action of the rigid $\mathcal{N} = 2$ sigma model can be written as follows (see [11]):

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{N}=2} = \int d^4x \Big[h_{uv}\partial^\mu q^u\,\partial_\mu q^v \;&-\; \mathrm{i}\Big(\overline{\zeta}^{\mathcal{I}}\,\gamma^\mu\,\partial_\mu\zeta_{\mathcal{I}} + \overline{\zeta}_{\mathcal{I}}\gamma^\mu\,\partial_\mu\zeta^{\mathcal{I}}\Big) \\ &+\; \frac{1}{2}\,\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}}{}_{\mathcal{J}|ts}\,\mathcal{U}^t_{A\mathcal{K}}\,\mathcal{U}^s_{B\mathcal{L}}\,\varepsilon^{AB}\,\mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{P}}\,\overline{\zeta}_{\mathcal{I}}\,\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}\,\overline{\zeta}^{\mathcal{J}}\,\zeta^{\mathcal{K}}\Big]\end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

the four-Fermi interactions being dictated by the $\mathfrak{usp}(2m)$ curvature $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}}{}_{\mathcal{J}|ts}$ of the HyperKähler target manifold.

The supersymmetry transformations with respect to which the action (3.1) is invariant have the following form (see [11]):

$$\mathcal{U}^{\mathcal{I}A}_u(q)\,\delta q^u \;=\; \varepsilon^{AB}\,\mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{J}}\,\overline{c}_B\zeta_{\mathcal{J}} + \overline{c}^A\zeta^{\mathcal{I}} \tag{3.2}$$

$$\delta\zeta_{\mathcal{I}} \;=\; \mathrm{i}\mathcal{U}^{\mathcal{J}B}_u\,\nabla_\mu q^u\,\gamma^\mu c^A\,\varepsilon_{AB}\,\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{J}} \tag{3.3}$$

$$\delta\zeta^{\mathcal{I}} \;=\; \mathrm{i}\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{J}B|u}\,\nabla_\mu q^u\,\gamma^\mu c_A\,\varepsilon^{AB}\,\mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{J}} \tag{3.4}$$

where the anticommuting SUSY parameters have being denoted c_A and c^A. These are chiral spinors $\gamma_5 c_A = c_A$, $\gamma_5 c^B = -c^B$ that transform in the fundamental $\frac{1}{2}$ representation of $\mathfrak{su}(2)_{\mathrm{I}}$.

The quantum number assignments of all the fields of the generic $\mathcal{N} = 2$ sigma model are summarized in table 1 where the Euclidian spin group has been split into its left and right factors:

$$\mathfrak{so}(4)_{spin} \;=\; \mathfrak{su}(2)_{\mathrm{L}} \oplus \mathfrak{su}(2)_{\mathrm{R}} \tag{3.5}$$

In such a table we display also the charges with respect to so named R-symmetry [15] that is the

Field name	$SU(2)_L$ rep.	$SU(2)_R$ rep.	$SU(2)_I$ rep.	USp(2m) rep.	R-sym R	degree d
q^u	0	0	0	0	0	0
$\mathcal{U}^{A\mathcal{I}}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	**2m**	0	1
$\mathcal{U}_{A\mathcal{I}}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\overline{\mathbf{2m}}$	0	1
$\zeta^{\alpha}_{\mathcal{I}}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	0	$\overline{\mathbf{2m}}$	-1	0
$\zeta^{\mathcal{I}}_{\dot{\alpha}}$	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	**2m**	1	0

Table 1: *Quantum Number assignments in the $\mathcal{N}=2$ sigma model*

phase symmetry defined by rotating the supersymmetry parameters in the following way:

$$c_A \rightarrow e^{\mathrm{i}\theta}\, c_A \quad ; \quad c^A \rightarrow e^{-\mathrm{i}\theta}\, c^A \tag{3.6}$$

The transformation equations (3.2,3.3,3.4) and the action (3.1) remain invariant if all the fields are rotated according to:

$$\text{field} \rightarrow e^{\mathrm{i}\, R_{field}\theta}\, \text{field} \tag{3.7}$$

The next step of this summary consists of the topological twist of the $\mathcal{N}=2$-theory that we have presented.

Before performing the formal manipulations that lead to such a twist it is convenient to analyze a crucial rewriting of the bosonic action:

$$\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{N}=2}_{Bose} \;=\; \int h_{uv}\, \partial_\mu q^u\, \partial_\nu q^v\, g^{\mu\nu} d^4x \tag{3.8}$$

which constitutes the real motivation to reinterpret this sigma-model as a topological field theory.

To this effect let us introduce the following $4 \times 4m$ bivector:

$$\mathcal{E}_\mu{}^u \equiv \partial_\mu q^u \,-\, \mathrm{O}_{xy}\, j^{x|\rho}_\mu\, \partial_\rho q^s\, J^{y|u}_s \tag{3.9}$$

where, according to (1.6), j^x and J^y denote the triplet of quaternionic complex structures, respectively of the base manifold $\mathcal{M}_4$ and of the target manifold $\mathcal{N}_{4m}$ and where $\mathrm{O} \in \mathrm{SO}(3)$ is an arbitrary orthogonal matrix in three-dimensions. Furthermore let us recall the following two identities:

$$\begin{aligned} h_{uv}\, J^{x|u}_s\, J^{y|v}_t &= \delta^{xy}\, h_{st} \,-\, \epsilon^{xy\ell}\, K^\ell_{st} \\ g^{\mu\nu}\, j^{x|\rho}_\mu\, j^{y|\sigma}_\nu &= \delta^{xy}\, g^{\rho\sigma} \,-\, \epsilon^{xy\ell}\, k^{\ell|\rho\sigma} \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

where $g_{\mu\nu}$ denotes the HyperKähler metric of the base manifold $\mathcal{M}_4$, h_{uv} that of the target manifold $\mathcal{N}_{4m}$ and where $k^\ell_{\rho\sigma}$ and K^ℓ_{st} are the components of the triplets of HyperKähler 2-forms $\mathbf{k}^\ell$ and $\mathbf{K}^\ell$ respectively defined on the two manifolds $\mathcal{M}_4$,$\mathcal{N}_{4m}$. Using (3.10), by means of a straightforward calculation one can verify that if we set:

$$\| \mathcal{E}_\mu{}^u \|^2 \equiv h_{uv}\, g^{\mu\nu}\, \mathcal{E}_\mu{}^u\, \mathcal{E}_\nu{}^v \tag{3.11}$$

we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \| \mathcal{E}_\mu{}^u \|^2 &= \left(1 + \mathrm{Tr}\left[\mathrm{O}^T\,\mathrm{O}\right]\right)\,\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{N}=2}_{Bose} + 4\,\mathrm{O}_{xy}\,(\mathbf{k}^x)^{\mu\nu}\,(q^\star\mathbf{K}^y)_{\mu\nu} \\ (q^\star\mathbf{K}^y)_{\mu\nu} &\equiv K^y_{uv}\,\partial_\mu q^u \partial_\nu q^v \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

where $q^\star\mathbf{K}^x$ denotes the pull-back of the HyperKähler forms of the target manifold onto the base-manifold by means of the map q. We further take into account that for any pair of 2-forms $\omega^{[2]}$ and $\pi^{[2]}$ we have:

$$\int \omega^{\mu\nu}\,\pi_{\mu\nu}\,\times\,\mathrm{Vol}_4 \,=\, \int \star_g\,\omega^{[2]}\wedge\pi^{[2]} \tag{3.13}$$

where $\star_g$ denotes the Hodge-dual with respect to the metric g and that the HyperKähler forms of the base manifold are chosen antiselfdual:

$$\star_g\,\mathbf{k}^x \,=\, -\,\mathbf{k}^x \tag{3.14}$$

Then from eq.(3.12) we conclude:

$$\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{N}=2}_{Bose} \,=\, \frac{1}{8}\,\underbrace{\mathrm{O}_{xy}\int_{\mathcal{M}_4}\mathbf{k}^x\wedge q_\star\mathbf{K}^y}_{\mathcal{A}_{top}[q,\mathrm{O}]} + \frac{1}{4}\underbrace{\int_{\mathcal{M}_4}\|\,\mathcal{E}_\mu{}^u\,\|^2\,\times\mathrm{Vol}_4}_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{Hyp}}[q,\mathrm{O}]} \tag{3.15}$$

Eq.(3.15) tells us that the classical action of the purely bosonic sigma-model is the sum of two terms. The first term is topological, independent from the base-manifold metric and from the continuous deformation of the map q within the same *homotopy class*. The second term is the integral of a perfect square. It follows that within each *homotopy class*, the classical action has an absolute minimal attained by those configurations that correspond to $\mathcal{E}_\mu{}^u = 0$. Looking back at eq. (3.9) we see that the vanishing of such a structure is precisely the condition of triholomorphicity discussed in the introduction (see eq. (1.6)) which defines the *hyperinstantons*.

There are still two relevant mathematical questions to be clarified:

a) How and to what degree of definiteness the topological number:

$$\mathcal{A}_{top}[q,\mathrm{O}] \,=\, \mathrm{O}_{xy}\int_{\mathcal{M}_4}\mathbf{k}^x\wedge q_\star\mathbf{K}^y \tag{3.16}$$

classifies the homotopy classes of the maps: $q\,:\,\mathcal{M}_4\,\rightarrow\,\mathcal{N}_{4m}$?

b What are the true indipendent choices of the orthogonal matrix O up to diffeomorphisms or other symmetries?

Postponing the important discussion of the above two points to later sections, we just observe that the topological interpretation of the sigma-model is effective and goes along classical lines if we succeed in proving that:

1. There is a suitable topological BRST-charge s with respect to which the topological term is BRST-closed but not exact:

$$s\,\mathcal{A}_{top}[q,\mathrm{O}] \;=\; 0 \quad ; \quad \text{(BRST-cocycle)} \tag{3.17}$$

2. There exists a suitable gauge fermion Ψ_{gauge}, such that

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{Hyp}}[q,\mathrm{O}] \;+\; \text{ghost - antighost terms} \;=\; s\,\Psi_{gauge} \tag{3.18}$$

Under the above conditions we can interpret $\mathcal{A}_{top}[q,\mathrm{O}]$ as the classical action of a topological field theory and $\mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{Hyp}}[q,\mathrm{O}]$ as the leading terms of a BRST gauge fixing of the topological symmetry. With the usual argument that being BRST-exact the term $\mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{Hyp}}[q,\mathrm{O}]$ can be multiplied by an arbitrary constant $t \to \infty$ we obtain localization of the functional integral on the hyperinstanton configurations. In particular all this is assured if the hyperinstanton equation $\mathcal{E}_{\mu}{}^{u}$ happens to be the BRST-variation of a suitable antighost.

The above outlined programme is realized by the topological twist of the 4D $\mathcal{N}=2$ sigma-model: we describe it in detail below. Before doing that we want to emphasize a very crucial detail that will turn out to be at the core of all our results.

Let us first consider the standard mechanism behind the BRST-invariance of a topological action such as (3.16). Usually we have that the integrand, in our case $\mathfrak{I}^{(4,0)} \;=\; \mathrm{O}_{xy}\;\mathbf{k}^{x}\wedge q_{\star}\mathbf{K}^{y}$, is a top-form satisfying a descent equation of the form:

$$\mathrm{s}\,\mathfrak{I}^{(4,0)} \;=\; \mathrm{d}\,\mathfrak{I}^{(3,1)} \tag{3.19}$$

where the labels (d,g) specify the degree as a differential form and the ghost number of the labeled object. Eq.(3.19) is true also in the case of the hyperinstantons we consider in this paper. Then we obtain:

$$\mathrm{s}\int_{\mathcal{M}_4}\mathfrak{I}^{(4,0)} \;=\; \int_{\mathcal{M}_4}\mathrm{d}\,\mathfrak{I}^{(3,1)} \;=\; \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}_4}\mathfrak{I}^{(3,1)} \tag{3.20}$$

If the base manifold has no boundary $\partial\mathcal{M}_4 \;=\; 0$, the last integral in eq.(3.20) vanishes and the topological action is BRST invariant. However it is an intrinsic crucial feature of our hyperintantons that the base manifold is just $\mathbb{R}_{+}\times\mathrm{T}^3$, which has a boundary. Hence the last integral in eq.(3.20) has to be considered. If the boundary conditions on the fields are such that it vanishes, then the topological action is BRST invariant and the topological field theory obtained by the twist procedure stands on its feet. The condition for BRST invariance is thus clearly formulated.

3.1 Detailed derivation of the topological twist

We assume that the target HyperKähler manifold has the reduced holonomy mentioned in eq.(2.20). Then all the fields can be classified with the following quantum numbers:

$$^{R}\,(\mathrm{L},\mathrm{R},\mathrm{I},\mathrm{Q})_{d} \tag{3.21}$$

Field name	$SU(2)_L$ rep.	$SU(2)_R$ rep.	$SU(2)_I$ rep.	$SU(2)_Q$ rep.	SO(m) rep.	R-sym R	degree d
q^u	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$\mathcal{U}_k{}^A{}_{\dot{B}}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	**m**	0	1
$\mathcal{U}_{kA}{}^{\dot{B}}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	**m**	0	1
$\zeta_k^{\alpha\dot{A}}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	**m**	-1	0
$\zeta_{\dot{\alpha}\dot{A}\|k}$	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	**m**	1	0

Table 2: *Quantum Number assignments in the $\mathcal{N}=2$ sigma model with restricted holonomy. The indices $\alpha,\beta=1,2$ span the fundamental representation of $\mathfrak{su}(2)_L$. The indices $\dot{\alpha},\dot{\beta}=\dot{1},\dot{2}$, span the fundamental representation of $\mathfrak{su}(2)_R$. The indices $A,B=1,2$, span the fundamental representation of $\mathfrak{su}(2)_I$.The indices $\dot{A},\dot{B}=\dot{1},\dot{2}$, span the fundamental representation of $\mathfrak{su}(2)_Q$.*

where R denotes the R-charge, d denotes the form degree and L,R,I,Q denote the representations with respect to the SU(2)-groups, L,R,I,Q.

The explicit charge assignments are mentioned in table 2.

According to [10] the topological twist is performed by means of the following formal steps:

1. The spin of the fields is redefined by means of an identification of the original spin group with the bundle structural group $\mathfrak{so}(4)_{IQ}$ defined in eq.(2.25). Explicitly one sets:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{so}(4)'_{spin} &= \mathfrak{su}(2)'_L \oplus \mathfrak{su}(2)'_R \\ \mathfrak{su}(2)'_L &= \mathrm{diag}\,[\mathfrak{su}(2)_L \oplus \mathfrak{su}(2)_Q] \\ \mathfrak{su}(2)'_R &= \mathrm{diag}\,[\mathfrak{su}(2)_R \oplus \mathfrak{su}(2)_I]\end{aligned} \tag{3.22}$$

2. One identifies the R-symmetry charge with the ghost number g.

3. According to the above scheme, after the twist the quantum numbers that characterize any field are $(L',R')^g_d$ and we have:

$$^R\,(L,R,I,Q)_d \;\to\; (L+Q,R+I)^R_d \;\equiv\; (L',R')^g_d \tag{3.23}$$

4. Decomposing the supersymmetry parameters into irriducible representations before and after the twist we have:

$$c^{A\dot{\beta}} = \left(0,\tfrac{1}{2},\tfrac{1}{2},0\right) \to \left(0,\tfrac{1}{2}+\tfrac{1}{2}\right) = \underbrace{(0,0)}_{BRST\,param.} + (0,1) \tag{3.24}$$

$$c_{A\alpha} = \left(\tfrac{1}{2},0,\tfrac{1}{2},0\right) \to \left(\tfrac{1}{2},\tfrac{1}{2}\right) \tag{3.25}$$

and we identify the BRST-charge as the operator corresponding to the unique scalar supersymmetry parameter with respect to the redefined spin group. In practice the BRST algebra is obtained from the supersymmetry transformation rules (3.2,3.3, 3.4) by setting:

$$c^{A\dot{\beta}} = \epsilon^{A\dot{\beta}} \underbrace{\mathbf{e}}_{\substack{BRST \\ param.}} \quad ; \quad c_{A\beta} = 0 \tag{3.26}$$

Field name	$SU(2)_L{}'$ rep.	$SU(2)_R{}'$ rep.	SO(m) rep.	ghost number g	degree d	interpret.
q^u	0	0	0	0	0	phys. field
$\mathcal{U}_k{}^A{}_{\dot{B}}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	**m**	0	1	phys.field
$\mathcal{U}_{kA}{}^{\dot{B}}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	**m**	0	1	phys. field
$\zeta_k^{\alpha\dot{A}}$	$\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{2}$	0	**m**	-1	0	antighost
$\zeta_{\dot{\alpha}}{}^{\dot{A}}{}_{\vert k}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	**m**	1	0	top ghost

Table 3: *Quantum Number assignments of all the fields after topological twist.*

The quantum numbers of all the fields after the twist and their interpretation within the BRST complex are displayed in table 3 and their BRST transformations take the following explicit form:

$$\mathcal{U}_{u|k}{}^A{}_{\dot{B}}\, sq^u = \epsilon^{A\dot{\beta}}\, \zeta_{\dot{\beta}\dot{B}|k} \tag{3.27}$$

$$s\,\zeta_{\dot{\beta}\dot{B}|k} = 0 \tag{3.28}$$

$$s\,\zeta_k^{\alpha\dot{A}} = \mathrm{i}\left(e_\mu^\dagger\, e_\nu\right)^\alpha{}_{\dot{C}}\, \epsilon^{\dot{A}\dot{C}} E^\nu_{k|u} \partial^\mu q^u \tag{3.29}$$

In the last of the above equations we made use of the explicit form of the gamma matrix basis introduced in eq.(2.27).

Next raising the index $\dot{A}$ as provided by the epsilon-symbol, we conclude that the variation of the antighost has the following appearance:

$$s\,\zeta_k^{\alpha\dot{A}} = \mathrm{i}\left(e_\mu^\dagger\, e_\nu\right)^{\alpha\dot{A}} E^\nu_{k|u} \partial^\mu q^u \tag{3.30}$$

There are two cases in the decomposition of a two-index tensor $t^{\alpha\dot{A}}$, the antisymmetric case that counts one degrees of freedom and the symmetric case that counts three degrees of freedom. Hence we can set:

$$\zeta_k^{\alpha\dot{A}} = \epsilon^{\alpha\dot{A}}\, \zeta_k^\bullet + \mathrm{i}\, \sigma_x^{\alpha\dot{A}}\, \zeta_k^x \tag{3.31}$$

Projecting onto the two cases we get:

$$s\,\zeta_k^{\bullet} \;\propto\; g_{\mu\nu}\,E^{\nu}_{k|u}\partial^{\mu}q^{u} \tag{3.32}$$

$$s\,\zeta_k^{x} \;\propto\; J^{+x}_{\mu\nu}\,E^{\nu}_{k|u}\partial^{\mu}q^{u} \tag{3.33}$$

If we introduce the matrix:

$$A_k^{\nu\mu} \;=\; E^{\nu}_{k|u}\partial^{\mu}q^{u} \tag{3.34}$$

vanishing of the BRST variation of the two antighosts $\zeta_k^{\bullet}$ and ζ_k^{x}, which is what defines the topological gauge fixing, implies the two conditions:

$$A_k^{\nu\mu}g_{\mu\nu} \;=\; 0 \tag{3.35}$$

$$A_k^{[\nu\mu]} \;+\; \tfrac{1}{2}\,\epsilon^{\mu\mu\rho\sigma}\,A_k^{[\rho\sigma]} \;=\; 0 \tag{3.36}$$

Indeed the self-dual character of $J^{+x}_{\mu\nu}$ in eq.(3.33) yields the result that the self-dual part of the tensor $A_k^{[\nu\mu]}$ is set to zero.

In [10] it was shown that eq.s (3.35) and (3.36) are equivalent to the statement:

$$A_k \;-\; J^x \circ A_k \circ J^x \;=\; 0 \tag{3.37}$$

which on its turn is the same as the triholomorphicity condition:

$$\partial^{\mu}q^{u} \;-\; J^{-x|\mu\rho}\,\partial_{\rho}q_s\,J^{-x|su} \;=\; 0 \tag{3.38}$$

In the case of flat HyperKähler manifold eq.(3.38) is alternatively rewritten as (3.36) or:

$$\partial_{\mu}q_{\mu} = 0, \quad \partial_{\mu}q_{\nu} - \partial_{\nu}q_{\mu} + \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\partial^{\rho}q^{\sigma} = 0. \tag{3.39}$$

Here we note that the second equation can be viewed as a self-duality condition of the field strength $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_{\mu}q_{\nu} - \partial_{\nu}q_{\mu}$ and the first equations resemble a gauge fixing for the potential q_{μ}. We would like to underlying that the latter is not a choice since that equation stems from the triholomorphic map condition and it can not be changed. This point is clearly discussed also in [10].

4 Triholomorphic hyperinstantons and Beltrami vector fields

Having clarified the local and global structure of both the base and the target space, we conclude that the maps

$$q \;:\; \mathcal{M}_4 \;\to\; \mathcal{N}_4 \tag{4.1}$$

that constitute the functional space of our considered sigma-model have to be periodic up to the lattice Λ, namely we must have:

$$\forall \mathbf{v} \;\in\; \Lambda \quad : \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{rcl} q^0(\mathrm{U},\mathbf{X}+\mathbf{v}) & = & q^0(\mathrm{U},\mathbf{X}) \quad ; \quad |q^0(\mathrm{U},\mathbf{X})| < \infty \\ \mathbf{q}(\mathrm{U},\mathbf{X}+\mathbf{v}) & = & \mathbf{q}(\mathrm{U},\mathbf{X}) \quad ; \quad |\mathbf{q}(\mathrm{U},\mathbf{X})| < \infty \end{array} \right. \tag{4.2}$$

where we have denoted $\mathbf{X} = \{\mathrm{X}, \mathrm{Y}, \mathrm{Z}\}$ and $\mathbf{q} = \{\mathrm{q}^1, \mathrm{q}^2, \mathrm{q}^3\}$. We will discuss below how we can implement the above boundary condition in our functional space.

The main point of this section is to show that the hyperinstanton equation (1.6) with $\mathrm{O} = \mathbf{1}$ reduces to Beltrami equation (1.1) for vector fields in $D = 3$.

We assume the following ansatz:

$$\frac{\mathbf{q}(U, \mathbf{X})}{q_0(U, \mathbf{X})} = \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{X})\,, \tag{4.3}$$

namely the ratio between the "spatial" components $\mathbf{q}$ and the "time" component is independent of the time coordinate U and it is a periodic function of T^3 (the coordinates $\mathbf{q}/q_0$ are coordinates on a projective space, we can view the space as a cone over T^3). We can solve this ansatz by setting

$$q_0(\mathrm{U}, \mathbf{X}) = f(\mathrm{U})\, G(\mathbf{X})\,, \qquad \mathbf{q}(\mathrm{U}, \mathbf{X}) = f(\mathrm{U})\, \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{X})\,, \tag{4.4}$$

Equations (3.38) become

$$\partial_{\mathrm{U}} q_0 + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{q} = 0\,, \qquad \partial_{\mathrm{U}} \mathbf{q} - \nabla q_0 + \nabla \times \mathbf{q} = 0\,. \tag{4.5}$$

The gradient ∇ is taken over the spatial coordinates, namely on the base manifold. Inserting the ansatz (4.4) into (4.5) we get the following equations

$$f^{-1}\partial_{\mathrm{U}} f = -G^{-1}\nabla \cdot \mathbf{H} = 0\,, \qquad (f^{-1}\partial_{\mathrm{U}} f)\mathbf{H} - \nabla G + \nabla \times \mathbf{H} = 0\,. \tag{4.6}$$

In the first equation, by separation of variables, we set $f^{-1}\partial_U f = -\mu$ with $\mu > 0$, leading to $f(\mathrm{U}) = Ke^{-\mu \mathrm{U}}$ defined on $\mathbb{R}_+$. Thus, the two equations read

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{H} = \mu\, G\,, \qquad \nabla \times \mathbf{H} - \mu\, \mathbf{H} = \nabla G\,, \tag{4.7}$$

Acting with ∇ on the second equation we get $-\mu \nabla \cdot \mathbf{H} = \nabla^2 G$ which implies

$$\nabla^2 G = -\mu^2 G\,. \tag{4.8}$$

In addition, we can redefine $\mathbf{H}$ as

$$\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{Y} - \frac{1}{\mu}\nabla G\,, \tag{4.9}$$

to get

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{Y} = 0\,, \qquad \nabla \times \mathbf{Y} - \mu \mathbf{Y} = 0\,. \tag{4.10}$$

The first equation is a consequence of the second equation (assuming that $\mu \neq 0$) and the latter is the vectorial version of the Beltrami equation for the 1-form $\mathbf{Y}_{[1]}$ discussed in the introduction. Written in form language, (4.10) are

$$\mathrm{d} \star \mathbf{Y}_{[1]} = 0\,, \qquad \star\, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{Y}_{[1]} - \mu \mathbf{Y}_{[1]} = 0\,. \tag{4.11}$$

In this way, we have proven that all "conical" solutions with the ansatz (4.3) are in correspondence with solutions of the Beltrami differential equation (4.11).

If $\partial_{\rm U} f = 0$, namely if $\mu = 0$, we get a different solution

$$\mathbf{H} = \nabla \times \mathbf{A}\,, \qquad G = \nabla \cdot \mathbf{A}\,, \qquad \nabla^2 \mathbf{A} = 0\,. \tag{4.12}$$

where the last equation is the Laplace equation on the torus T^3, whose solutions are very well-known.

In conclusion, in view of the above discussion we can write the general form of the triholomorphic hyperinstantons:

$$q \,:\, \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathrm{T}^3 \,\to\, \mathbb{R}^4 \tag{4.13}$$

in the following form:

$$q(\mathrm{U}, \mathbf{X}) \,=\, \sum_{\mu \in \mathfrak{S}} \sum_{\mathfrak{m} \in \mathfrak{M}(\mu)} q_{[\mu]}\,(\mathrm{U}, \mathbf{X}|\mathfrak{m}) \tag{4.14}$$

where $\mathfrak{S}$ denotes the spectrum of eigenvalues μ of the $\star_g \mathrm{d}$ operator on T^3, whose squares μ^2 are eigenvalues of minus the Laplacian on the same space, and $\mathfrak{M}(\mu)$ denotes the parameter space of solutions of eq.s (4.11) and (4.9) combined together. Setting:

$$\begin{array}{rcl@{\quad;\quad}rcl} \Box_{\mathrm{T}^3} \mathfrak{W}^{\ell}_{[\mu]}\,(\mathbf{X}) & = & -4\,\mu^2\,\mathfrak{W}^{\ell}_{[\mu]}\,(\mathbf{X}) & \ell & = & 1, \ldots, \delta_\mu \\ \star\, \mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{T}^3} \mathbf{Y}^{[\mu|I]}\,(\mathbf{X}) & = & \mu\, \mathbf{Y}^{[\mu|I]}\,(\mathbf{X}) & I & = & 1, \ldots, d_\mu \end{array} \tag{4.15}$$

where δ_μ and d_μ are the degeneracies, respectively of the Laplacian eigenvalue and of the $\star$d eigenvalue, we can write the general solution as follows:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \Phi_{[\mu]}\,(\mathrm{U}, \mathbf{X}) & = & e^{-2\,\mu\,\mathrm{U}} \displaystyle\sum_{\ell=1}^{\delta_\mu} \mathfrak{b}_{\mu,\ell}\, \mathfrak{W}^{\ell}_{[\mu]}\,(\mathbf{X}) \\ \Omega_{[\mu]}\,(\mathrm{U}, \mathbf{X}) & = & e^{-\,2\,\mu\,\mathrm{U}} \displaystyle\sum_{I=1}^{d_\mu} \mathfrak{c}_{\mu,I}\, \mathbf{Y}^{[\mu|I]}\,(\mathbf{X}) \\ q^0_{[\mu]}\,(\mathrm{U}, \mathbf{X}|\mathfrak{m}) & = & -\,\partial_{\mathrm{U}}\, \Phi_{[\mu]}\,(\mathrm{U}, \mathbf{X}) \\ \mathbf{q}_{[\mu]}\,(\mathrm{U}, \mathbf{X}|\mathfrak{m}) & = & \nabla\, \Phi_{[\mu]}\,(\mathrm{U}, \mathbf{X}) \,+\, \Omega_{[\mu]}\,(\mathrm{U}, \mathbf{X}) \end{array} \tag{4.16}$$

where $\mathfrak{c}_{\mu,I}$ are constant parameters. In comparison with equations (4.4,4.5,4.6,4.7) we see that we can identify $G(\mathbf{X}) \,=\, \sum_{\ell=1}^{\delta_\mu} \mathfrak{b}_{\mu,\ell}\, \mathfrak{W}^{\ell}_{[\mu]}\,(\mathbf{X})$, $f(U) \,=\, e^{-2\,\mu}$, $\mathbf{Y}(\mathbf{X}) \,=\, \sum_{I=1}^{d_\mu} \mathfrak{c}_{\mu,I}\, \mathbf{Y}^{[\mu|I]}\,(\mathbf{X})$. The parameters $\mathfrak{m}$ are given by the union of the $\mathfrak{c}_{\mu,I}$ with the $\mathfrak{b}_{\mu,\ell}$.

The spectrum $\mathfrak{S}$ of the operator $\star \mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{T}^3}$ was completely calculated in [6] and organized into irreducible representations of a Universal Classifying Group. An easy by-product of that calculation and of that classification is the derivation of the spectrum of the laplacian operator. In fact we just find that the degeneracies of the two operators are the same at equal value of μ:

$$d_\mu \,=\, \delta_\mu \tag{4.17}$$

Hence the total dimension of the parameter space $\mathfrak{M}(\mu)$ of a μ-hyperinstanton is $2 \times d_\mu$.

4.1 The standard Fourier expansion on T^3 and the condition of triholomorphicity

In the previous subsection we have seen that, under the mild condition (4.4), the first order differential constraint of triholomorphicity (3.38) is equivalent to Beltrami equation (1.1) on the three-torus; in this way the enumeration of hyperinstantons can be reduced to the doubled enumeration of solutions of the first order differential equation of Beltrami. This provides a powerful tool to organize the functional integration localized on the hyperinstantons into a discrete sum over the spectrum $\mathfrak{S}$ of the $\star_g \mathrm{d}$ operator plus a finite dimensional integration over the parameter space of hyperinstantons at fixed eigenvalue μ. Such an organization of the functional integration will be illustrated in the next subsection 4.2. In the present one, in order to appreciate the field theoretical meaning of that construction we consider the standard expansion of the scalar fields $q^u(\mathrm{U}, \mathbf{X})$ into Fourier modes on the three-torus and we analyse the triholomorphic constraint in momentum space.

Interpreting the coordinate U as the euclidian time after Wick rotation, the 4 coordinates q^u of the target space are just 4 scalar fields quantized with periodic boundary condition in a cubic box (namely T^3) and in full generality we can write the discrete Fourier expansion:

$$q^u(\mathrm{U}, \mathbf{X}) \,=\, \sum_{\mathbf{k}\in\Lambda} \exp\left[2\,\pi\,\mathrm{i}\,\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{X}\right]\, a^u_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathrm{U}) \tag{4.18}$$

where Λ is the cubic lattice given by all momentum three-vectors $\mathbf{k} = \{k_x, k_y, k_z\}$ whose components are integer valued: $k_{x,y,z} \in \mathbb{Z}$. The reality of the scalar fields q^u yields the standard condition:

$$a^u_{-\mathbf{k}}(\mathrm{U}) \,=\, a^u_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathrm{U})^\star \tag{4.19}$$

Hence to each momentum pair $(\pm\mathbf{k})$ we associate $4 \times 2 = 8$ real parameters depending on the *time* U:

$$a^u_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathrm{U}) \,=\, \alpha^u_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathrm{U}) \,+\, \mathrm{i}\,\beta^u_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathrm{U}) \tag{4.20}$$

Let us now impose the classical field equation of the free field:

$$\Box_{\mathbb{R}_+\times\mathrm{T}^3}\, q^u \,=\, \sum_{\mathbf{k}\in\Lambda} \exp\left[2\,\pi\,\mathrm{i}\,\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{X}\right]\, \left[-4\,\pi^2\,\mathbf{k}^2\,\alpha^u_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathrm{U}) \,+\, \ddot{\alpha}^u_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathrm{U})\right] \,=\, 0 \tag{4.21}$$

which is solved by setting:

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha^u_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathrm{U}) \;&=\; \exp\left[-2\,\pi\,\mu\,\mathrm{U}\right]\, \left(\alpha^{u|+}_{\mathbf{k}} \,+\, \mathrm{i}\beta^{u|+}_{\mathbf{k}}\right) \,+\, \exp\left[2\,\pi\,\mu\,\mathrm{U}\right]\, \left(\alpha^{u|-}_{\mathbf{k}} \,+\, \mathrm{i}\beta^{u|-}_{\mathbf{k}}\right) \\
\alpha^u_{-\mathbf{k}}(\mathrm{U}) \;&=\; \exp\left[-2\,\pi\,\mu\,\mathrm{U}\right]\, \left(\alpha^{u|+}_{\mathbf{k}} \,-\, \mathrm{i}\beta^{u|+}_{\mathbf{k}}\right) \,+\, \exp\left[2\,\pi\,\mu\,\mathrm{U}\right]\, \left(\alpha^{u|-}_{\mathbf{k}} \,-\, \mathrm{i}\beta^{u|-}_{\mathbf{k}}\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{4.22}$$

where:

$$\mu \,\equiv\, \sqrt{\mathbf{k}^2} \tag{4.23}$$

Hence for each pair of momentum vectors $\pm\mathbf{k} \in \Lambda$ the general solution of the classical second order field equation contains $4 \times 4 = 16$ real parameters given by $\alpha^{u|\pm}_{\mathbf{k}}$ and $\beta^{u|\pm}_{\mathbf{k}}$.

Let us next consider the constraint of triholomorphicity in Fourier space. Any of the above described classical solutions can be rewritten as:

$$q^u \;=\; \sum_p \exp\left[2\,\pi\,p^\nu\,x_\nu\right]\;a^u(p) \tag{4.24}$$

where:

$$p^\nu \;=\; \{\omega, \mathrm{i}k_x, \mathrm{i}k_y, \mathrm{i}k_z\} \quad \text{with} \quad \omega \;=\; \pm\sqrt{\mathbf{k}^2} \tag{4.25}$$

Inserting (4.24) into the constraint of triholomorphicity (3.38) we obtain the algebraic condition:

$$\mathfrak{E}_{\mu\nu|uv}\,p^\nu\,a^v(p) \;=\; 0 \tag{4.26}$$

where the constant numerical tensor $\mathfrak{E}_{\mu\nu|uv}$ is defined as follows:

$$\mathfrak{E}_{\mu\nu|uv} \;\equiv\; \delta_{\mu\nu}\,\delta_{uv} \;+\; \sum_{x=1}^{3} J_{\mu\nu}^{-|x}\,J_{uv}^{-|x} \tag{4.27}$$

It follows that for each momentum vector p^ν the coefficient vector $\vec{a} = a^u(p)$ has to be annihilated by four matrices:

$$\left(\mathbf{E}_\mu\right)_{uv} \;\equiv\; \mathfrak{E}_{\mu\nu|uv}\,p^\nu \quad ; \quad \mathbf{E}_\mu \cdot \vec{a} \;=\; 0 \tag{4.28}$$

Let us consider the explicit form of these matrices:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}_0 \;&=\; \begin{pmatrix} -\omega & \mathrm{i}k_x & \mathrm{i}k_y & \mathrm{i}k_z \\ -\mathrm{i}k_x & -\omega & -\mathrm{i}k_z & \mathrm{i}k_y \\ -\mathrm{i}k_y & \mathrm{i}k_z & -\omega & -\mathrm{i}k_x \\ -\mathrm{i}k_z & -\mathrm{i}k_y & \mathrm{i}k_x & -\omega \end{pmatrix} \quad ; \quad \mathbf{E}_x \;=\; \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{i}k_x & \omega & \mathrm{i}k_z & -\mathrm{i}k_y \\ -\omega & \mathrm{i}k_x & \mathrm{i}k_y & \mathrm{i}k_z \\ -\mathrm{i}k_z & -\mathrm{i}k_y & \mathrm{i}k_x & -\omega \\ \mathrm{i}k_y & -\mathrm{i}k_z & \omega & \mathrm{i}k_x \end{pmatrix} \\
\mathbf{E}_y \;&=\; \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{i}k_y & -\mathrm{i}k_z & \omega & \mathrm{i}k_x \\ \mathrm{i}k_z & \mathrm{i}k_y & -\mathrm{i}k_x & \omega \\ -\omega & \mathrm{i}k_x & \mathrm{i}k_y & \mathrm{i}k_z \\ -\mathrm{i}k_x & -\omega & -\mathrm{i}k_z & \mathrm{i}k_y \end{pmatrix} \quad ; \quad \mathbf{E}_z \;=\; \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{i}k_z & \mathrm{i}k_y & -\mathrm{i}k_x & \omega \\ -\mathrm{i}k_y & \mathrm{i}k_z & -\omega & -\mathrm{i}k_x \\ \mathrm{i}k_x & \omega & \mathrm{i}k_z & -\mathrm{i}k_y \\ -\omega & \mathrm{i}k_x & \mathrm{i}k_y & \mathrm{i}k_z \end{pmatrix}
\end{aligned} \tag{4.29}$$

If we calculate the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{E}_0$ we obtain:

$$\lambda \;=\; \left\{-\sqrt{k_x^2+k_y^2+k_z^2}-\omega, -\sqrt{k_x^2+k_y^2+k_z^2}-\omega, \sqrt{k_x^2+k_y^2+k_z^2}-\omega, \sqrt{k_x^2+k_y^2+k_z^2}-\omega\right\} \tag{4.30}$$

This means that $\mathbf{E}_0$ has a non vanishing null space only under the on-shell condition:

$$\omega \;=\; \pm\sqrt{\mathbf{k}^2} \tag{4.31}$$

For each choice of the sign in eq. (4.31) the complex dimension of the null-space is just 2. It remains to be seen whether the null eigenvectors are annihilated also by $\mathbf{E}_{x,y,z}$. By explicit calculation we find

that indeed they are. Hence for each choice of the frequency ω associated with a pair of momenta $\pm\mathbf{k} \in \Lambda$ in the cubic lattice we have 4 real parameters. In conclusion, taking into account both frequencies the number of real parameters in a general solution of the triholomorphic constraint associated with each momentum pair $\pm\mathbf{k}$ is 8 rather than 16 as it is the case for a generic classical solution. In other words the triholomorphic hyperinstantons are just one half of all the classical solutions.

From the above discussion it follows that the functional integration localized on the hyperinstantons can be performed by summing independently on each pair of lattice momenta $\pm\mathbf{k} \in \Lambda$ and for each pair integrating on the 4 real parameters. Furthermore if we restrict the integration to functions that are square integrable over $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathrm{T}^3$ we have to discard the solutions with frequency $\omega = \sqrt{\mathbf{k}^2}$ which diverge exponentially at $\mathrm{U} \to \infty$ and keep only the solutions with the negative frequency $\omega = -\sqrt{\mathbf{k}^2}$. Consequently the continuous integration for each pair of lattice momenta $\pm\mathbf{k}$ is restricted to 4 real parameters. Equivalently we can say that triholomorphicity plus square integrability reduces the number of parameters to 2 for each momentum vector.

4.2 The hyperinstanton functional space and octahedral orbits in the momentum lattice

Let us now reorganize the hyperinstanton functional space in a different order which takes advantage of the relation between the triholomorphic constraint (3.38) and Beltrami equation.

The key observation is that the lattice sum $\sum_{\mathbf{k}\in\Lambda}$ can be reorganized as the following sum:

$$\sum_{\mathbf{k}\in\Lambda} \simeq \sum_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{n}}\subset\Lambda} \sum_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{n}}} \tag{4.32}$$

where $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{p}}$ denotes a finite set of lattice momenta that form an orbit under the action of the octahedral group $\mathrm{O}_{24} \subset \mathrm{SO}(3)$. This finite group which is isomorphic to the symmetric group S_4 is the point-group of the cubic lattice, namely it is the discrete subgroup of rotations that map the lattice into itself. The advantage in the reorganization of the lattice sum according to eq.(4.32) is that the possible orbits of O_{24} fall into 5 types each type including an infinite number of identical copies labeled by increasing natural numbers $\mathbf{n} = \{n_x, n_y, n_z\}$. For each of the five types of orbits the solution of Beltrami equation and hence of the triholomorphic constraint has a universal form containing a fixed predetermined number of parameters. In this way the functional integration on hyperinstantons admits the following very inspiring reorganization:

$$\int \exp\left[\int_{\mathcal{M}_4} \mathbf{k}^x \wedge q_\star \mathbf{K}^x(t)\right] \mathcal{D}q \;=\; \sum_{I=1}^{5} \left(\sum_{\mathbf{n}} \int \exp\left[\int_{\mathcal{M}_4} \mathbf{k}^x \wedge q_\star^{[I]}\,(\mathfrak{m}|\mathbf{n})\,\mathbf{K}^x(t)\right] \mathrm{d}^{r_I}\mathfrak{m} \right) \tag{4.33}$$

where:

a) $\mathbf{K}^x(t)$ denote the HyperKähler forms of the target space depending on their moduli t^3

[3] As we discuss in the next section the orthogonal matrix O_{xy} can always be gauged fixed to 1, but what remains are the redefinitions of the HyperKähler forms $\mathbf{K}^x$ of the target manifold in terms of a rotation in the coset manifold $\mathfrak{so}(3,3)/\mathfrak{so}(3) \times \mathfrak{so}(3)$. See eq.(5.4)

b) $q_\star^{[I]}(\mathfrak{m}|\mathbf{n})$ denotes the general form of a hyperinstanton solution associated with an octahedral orbit of type I and degree $\mathbf{n}$, $\mathfrak{m}$ being its parameters.

c) r_I denotes the dimension of the parameter space of the the hyperinstanton $q_\star^{[I]}(\mathfrak{m}|\mathbf{n})$. The key point is that r_I depends only on the type and not on the degree $\mathbf{n}$.

In the sequel we show that:

$$\mathcal{A}_{top}\left[q^{[I]},t\right] \equiv \int_{\mathcal{M}_4} \mathbf{k}^x \wedge q_\star^{[I]}(\mathfrak{m}|\mathbf{n})\,\mathbf{K}^x(t) = \sum_{x=1}^{3} n_x\,\mathfrak{m}^{\mathcal{I}}\mathcal{Q}^{x|I}_{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{J}}(t)\mathfrak{m}^{\mathcal{J}} \tag{4.34}$$

where $\mathcal{Q}^{x|I}_{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{J}}(t)$ denotes a triplet of square $r_I \times r_I$ matrices that depend only on the moduli of the the HyperKähler forms and are the same for each orbit type, independently from the degree. In this way the functional integration on hyperinstantons reduces to just five gaussian integrations on continuous parameters whose results depend on integer numbers and have to be summed over them.

This strategy is effective since, thanks to the previous results obtained by two of us in [6] and [1], we already know the dimensions and the precise form of the parameter spaces for the solutions of the Beltrami equation which are associated with each octahedral orbit $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{n}}$ in the momentum lattice Λ_{cubic}. On the other hand, as we have shown above, every solution of the Beltrami equation can be mapped into a triholomorphic hyperinstanton.



Figure 1: *The momenta in the cubic lattice forming an orbit of length* 6 *under the octahedral group are of the form* $\{\pm n,0,0\}$, $\{0,\pm n,0\}$, $\{0,0,\pm n,\}$ *and correspond to the vertices of a regular octahedron.*

Hence, as we just anticipated, there are five type of octahedral orbits and as many types of hyperinstanton spaces:

1) The octahedral orbits $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{n,0,0}}$ of length 6 formed by the momentum vectors $\{\pm\mathbf{n},\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}\}$, $\{\mathbf{0},\pm\mathbf{n},\mathbf{0}\}$, $\{\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0},\pm\mathbf{n}\}$, where $\mathbf{n}\in\mathbb{Z}$. The number of parameters in the solution of the Beltrami equation is 6 and the corresponding hyperinstanton space (4.16) has therefore dimension 12. The eigenvalue of the Laplace-Beltrami operator is:

$$\mu \;=\; \pi\,\mathbf{n} \tag{4.35}$$

2) The octahedral orbits $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{n,n,0}}$ of length 12 formed by the momentum vectors $\{\pm\mathbf{n},\pm\mathbf{n},\mathbf{0}\}$, $\{\mathbf{0},\pm\mathbf{n},\pm\mathbf{n}\}$, $\{\pm\mathbf{n},\mathbf{0},\pm\mathbf{n}\}$, where $\mathbf{n}\in\mathbb{Z}$. The number of parameters in the solution of the Beltrami equation is 12 and the corresponding hyperinstanton space (4.16) has therefore dimension 24. The eigenvalue of the Laplace-Beltrami operator is:

$$\mu \;=\; \pi\sqrt{2}\,\mathbf{n} \tag{4.36}$$

3) The octahedral orbits $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{n,n,n}}$ of length 8 formed by the momentum vectors $\{\pm\mathbf{n},\pm\mathbf{n},\pm\mathbf{n}\}$ where $\mathbf{n}\in\mathbb{Z}$. The number of parameters in the solution of the Beltrami equation is 8 and the corresponding hyperinstanton space (4.16) has therefore dimension 16. The eigenvalue of the Laplace-Beltrami operator is:

$$\mu \;=\; \pi\sqrt{3}\,\mathbf{n} \tag{4.37}$$

4) The octahedral orbits $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{n,n,m}}$ of length 24 formed by the momentum vectors $\{\pm\mathbf{n},\pm\mathbf{n},\pm\mathbf{m}\}$, $\{\pm\mathbf{m},\pm\mathbf{n},\pm\mathbf{n}\}$, $\{\pm\mathbf{n},\pm\mathbf{m},\pm\mathbf{n}\}$, where $\mathbf{n}\neq\mathbf{m}\in\mathbb{Z}$. The number of parameters in the solution of the Beltrami equation is 24 and the corresponding hyperinstanton space (4.16) has therefore dimension 48. The eigenvalue of the Laplace-Beltrami operator is:

$$\mu \;=\; \pi\sqrt{2\,\mathbf{n}^2 \,+\, \mathbf{m}^2} \tag{4.38}$$

5) The octahedral orbits $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{n,m,r}}$ of length 48 formed by the momentum vectors $\{\pm\mathbf{n},\pm\mathbf{m},\pm\mathbf{r}\}$, $\{\pm\mathbf{m},\pm\mathbf{n},\pm\mathbf{r}\}$, $\{\pm\mathbf{n},\pm\mathbf{r},\pm\mathbf{m}\}$, $\{\pm\mathbf{r},\pm\mathbf{m},\pm\mathbf{n}\}$,$\{\pm\mathbf{m},\pm\mathbf{r},\pm\mathbf{n}\}$, $\{\pm\mathbf{r},\pm\mathbf{n},\pm\mathbf{m}\}$ where $\mathbf{n}\neq\mathbf{m}\neq\mathbf{r}\in\mathbb{Z}$. The number of parameters in the solution of the Beltrami equation is 48 and the corresponding hyperinstanton space (4.16) has therefore dimension 96. The eigenvalue of the Laplace-Beltrami operator is:

$$\mu \;=\; \pi\sqrt{\mathbf{n}^2 \,+\, \mathbf{m}^2 + \mathbf{r}^2} \tag{4.39}$$

According to this classification we immediately have the dimensions of the parameter spaces for the various types of orbits:

$$\begin{aligned} r_{\mathbf{n,0,0}} &= 12 \\ r_{\mathbf{n,n,0}} &= 24 \\ r_{\mathbf{n,n,n}} &= 16 \\ r_{\mathbf{n,n,m}} &= 48 \\ r_{\mathbf{n,m,r}} &= 96 \end{aligned} \tag{4.40}$$



Figure 2: *The momenta in the cubic lattice forming an orbit of length* 8 *under the octahedral group are of the form* $\{\pm n, \pm n, \pm n\}$*, and correspond to the vertices of a regular cube.*



Figure 3: *The momenta in the cubic lattice forming an orbit of length* 12 *under the octahedral group are of the form* $\{\pm n, \pm n, 0\}$,$\{0, \pm n, \pm n\}$, $\{\pm n, 0, \pm n\}$ *and correspond to mid-points of the edges of a regular cube.*

4.3 The role of the Universal Classifying Group G_{1536}

In [1],[6], inspired by the space group constructions of crystallography and by Frobenius congruences, two of us introduced an extension of the octahedral group by means of translations quantized in units of $\frac{1}{4}$. In each direction and modulo integers there are just four translations 0, $\frac{1}{4}$, $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{3}{4}$ so that the translation subgroup reduces to $\mathbb{Z}_4 \otimes \mathbb{Z}_4 \otimes \mathbb{Z}_4$ that has a total of 64 elements. In this way we singled out a discrete group G_{1536} of order $24 \times 64 = 1536$, which is simply the semidirect product of the point group O_{24} with $\mathbb{Z}_4 \otimes \mathbb{Z}_4 \otimes \mathbb{Z}_4$:

$$G_{1536} \simeq O_{24} \ltimes (\mathbb{Z}_4 \otimes \mathbb{Z}_4 \otimes \mathbb{Z}_4) \tag{4.41}$$

We named G_{1536} the universal classifying group of the cubic lattice. For all details relative to such



Figure 4: *A view of an orbit of length 24 in the cubic lattice: the lattice points are of the form* $\{\pm a, \pm a, \pm b\}$, $\{\pm a, \pm b, \pm a\}$,$\{\pm b, \pm a, \pm a\}$ *and intersect the sphere of radius* $r^2 = 2a^2 + b^2$

a group we refer the reader to the two papers [1], [6]. What is relevant to us here is that G_{1536} is certainly a global symmetry group of the topological sigma-model and that the parameter spaces of hyperinstantons decompose into irreducible representations of G_{1536}.

As shown in [1],[6] the group G_{1536} has 37 conjugacy classes whose populations are distributed as follows:

1) 2 classes of length 1

2) 2 classes of length 3

3) 2 classes of length 6

4) 1 class of length 8

5) 7 classes of length 12

6) 4 classes of length 24

7) 13 classes of length 48

8) 2 classes of length 96

9) 4 classes of length 128

It follows that there are 37 irreducible representations whose construction was performed in [1] relying on the method of induced representations. The 37 irreps are distributed according to the following pattern:

a) 4 irreps of dimension 1, namely $\mathrm{D}_1, \ldots, \mathrm{D}_4$

b) 2 irreps of dimension 2, namely $\mathrm{D}_5, \ldots, \mathrm{D}_6$

c) 12 irreps of dimension 3, namely $\mathrm{D}_6, \ldots, \mathrm{D}_{18}$

d) 10 irreps of dimension 6, namely $\mathrm{D}_7, \ldots, \mathrm{D}_{28}$

e) 3 irreps of dimension 8, namely $\mathrm{D}_{29}, \ldots, \mathrm{D}_{31}$

f) 6 irreps of dimension 12, namely $\mathrm{D}_{32}, \ldots, \mathrm{D}_{37}$

In [1] two of us thoroughly discussed the decomposition of the parameter-spaces of Beltrami vector fields (*i.e.* solutions of the Beltrami equation) into irreps of G_{1536}. Due to the relation between the hyperinstantons and Beltrami fields explained in the previous section such a decomposition extends canonically to the hyperinstanton parameter-spaces. In this way, we can make a third reorganization of the functional integral (4.33) as a discrete sum on the 37 irreducible representations plus a sum on their multiplicities and a continuous integral on the parameters pertaining to any such a representation.

From the above list, if we were to do so we see that the maximal dimension of an irreducible moduli-space is at most 12 and not 96 as displayed in eq.(4.40) for reducible moduli-spaces.

In particular in the present paper we restrict our attention to consider the parameter-spaces associated with the smallest momentum space octahedral orbits $\mathcal{O}_{\{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}\}}$ of length 6. As explained in [1], there are four classes of momentum vectors yielding orbits of length 6: $\{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}\}$. The decomposition into irreducible representations of the 12-dimensional moduli-spaces $\mathfrak{M}^{[12]}_{\{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}\}}$ is displayed below[4].

1. Class $\mathbf{k} = \{\mathbf{1} + \mathbf{4p}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}\}$ (where $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{Z}$). The splitting of the 12-dimensional moduli space is the following one:

$$\mathfrak{M}^{[12]}_{\{\mathbf{1}+\mathbf{4p},\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}\}} = \underbrace{\mathrm{D}_{23}\left[\mathrm{G}_{1536}, 6\right]}_{Beltrami} \oplus \mathrm{D}_{22}\left[\mathrm{G}_{1536}, 6\right] \tag{4.42}$$

[4]The results mentioned here and in all the sequel of this paper have been obtained by means of MATHEMATICA codes built on the basis of the corpus of MATHEMATICA codes utilized to derive the systematics exposed in [1].

2. Class $\mathbf{k} = \{\mathbf{2}+\mathbf{4p},\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}\}$ (where $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{Z}$). The splitting of the 12-dimensional moduli space is the following one:

$$\mathfrak{M}^{[12]}_{\{\mathbf{2}+\mathbf{4p},\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}\}} = \underbrace{\mathrm{D}_{19}\left[\mathrm{G}_{1536},6\right]}_{Beltrami} \oplus \mathrm{D}_{9}\left[\mathrm{G}_{1536},3\right] \oplus \mathrm{D}_{11}\left[\mathrm{G}_{1536},3\right] \tag{4.43}$$

3. Class $\mathbf{k} = \{\mathbf{3}+\mathbf{4p},\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}\}$ (where $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{Z}$). The splitting of the 12-dimensional moduli space is the following one:

$$\mathfrak{M}^{[12]}_{\{\mathbf{3}+\mathbf{4p},\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}\}} = \underbrace{\mathrm{D}_{24}\left[\mathrm{G}_{1536},6\right]}_{Beltrami} \oplus \mathrm{D}_{22}\left[\mathrm{G}_{1536},6\right] \tag{4.44}$$

4. Class $\mathbf{k} = \{\mathbf{0}+\mathbf{4p},\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}\}$ (where $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{Z}$). The splitting of the 12-dimensional moduli space is the following one:

$$\mathfrak{M}^{[12]}_{\{\mathbf{0}+\mathbf{4p},\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}\}} = \underbrace{\mathrm{D}_{7}\left[\mathrm{G}_{1536},3\right] \oplus \mathrm{D}_{8}\left[\mathrm{G}_{1536},3\right]}_{Beltrami} \oplus \mathrm{D}_{8}\left[\mathrm{G}_{1536},3\right] \oplus \mathrm{D}_{5}\left[\mathrm{G}_{1536},2\right] \oplus \mathrm{D}_{1}\left[\mathrm{G}_{1536},1\right] \tag{4.45}$$

The representations underwritten *Beltrami* are those that already appear in the decomposition of the Beltrami field $\mathbf{Y}^{[1]}$ (see [1]). The other representations are those that are contributed by the function $G(\mathbf{X})$ (see eq. (4.9)).

5 The coupling constants in the topological action and their geometry

We observe that a HyperKähler space is in particular Kähler and furthermore that our flat manifold is a Calabi-Yau two-fold: it has vanishing first Chern class of the tangent bundle $c_1(\mathcal{T}\mathbb{R}^4) = 0$.

In order to appreciate the geometrical meaning of the parameters in the Lagrangian and the new quality of the hyperinstantons occurring in the 4D sigma-model with respect to the holomorphic instantons occurring in the 2D sigma model, we will make a strict comparison with the classical results concerning those 2D σ-models whose target space is selected to be the Kummer surface K3. Since this latter is also HyperKähler it could be taken as target manifold also in the 4D case and comparison with it provides a formidable instructive case.

In view of that discussion of the K3 case it becomes clear what is the relevant structure of the topological coupling constants in the lagrangian of the 4D topological sigma-model under consideration. First of all, by means of a simple argument we can dispose the matrix O_{xy} that we have so far carried through our discussion.

According to the topological twist, the correct hyperinstanton equations are those where the equation is just (3.38). Yet given the above general solution (4.16) of such an equation, let us consider the following linear transformation on the solution:

$$\widehat{q}^{u}(\mathrm{U},\mathbf{X}) = q^{v}(\mathrm{U},\mathbf{X})\mathcal{S}_{v}{}^{u} \quad ; \quad \mathcal{S} \in \mathrm{SO}^{-}(3) \subset \mathrm{SO}(4) \tag{5.1}$$

where, by definition,$SO^-(3)$ is the subgroup of SO(4) that rotates the antiself-dual 't Hoft matrices among themselves. $SO^-(3)$ is generated by the very triplet of antiself-dual matrices $J^{-|x}$ and acts as follows:

$$\mathcal{S}^T\, J^{-|x}\, \mathcal{S} \,=\, (\mathrm{O}\,[\mathcal{S}])^{xy}\; J^{-|y} \tag{5.2}$$

where we have denoted by $\mathrm{O}\,[\mathcal{S}]$ the homomorphism:

$$\mathrm{SO}(4) \,\subset\, \mathrm{SO}^-(3) \stackrel{\mathrm{O}}{\Longrightarrow} \mathrm{SO}(3) \,=\, 3\times 3 \text{ matrices} \tag{5.3}$$

From equation (5.2) it follows that if $q^u(\mathrm{U},\mathbf{X})$ is triholomorphic with respect to $\mathrm{O} \,=\, 1$, than $\widehat{q}^u(\mathrm{U},\mathbf{X})$ is triholomorphic with respect $\mathrm{O}[\mathcal{S}]$. This shows that given (4.16) we easily obtain the general solution of the hyperinstanton equation for any matrix $\mathrm{O}\in \mathrm{SO}(3)$. On the other hand the transformation (5.1) is just a diffeomorphism of the target space, which is even an isometry. Hence the new hyperinstanton obtained by composing the original map with $\mathcal{S}$ is to be identified with the earlier one and does not correspond to a truly new solution. Fixing $\mathrm{O} \,=\, \mathbf{1}_{3\times 3}$ is just a convenient gauge-fixing of this symmetry. On the other hand we can write:

$$\mathbf{K}^x \,=\, \mathbb{L}(t)^{xJ}\,\alpha_J \quad ; \quad J \,=\, 1,2,3,\dot{1},\dot{2},\dot{3} \quad ; \quad x=1,2,3 \tag{5.4}$$

where α_J denotes the basis of harmonic two-forms defined in eq.(2.42) and the 6×6matrix:

$$\mathbb{L}(t)^{IJ} \,\in\, \frac{\mathrm{SO}(3,3)}{\mathrm{SO}(3)\times \mathrm{SO}(3)}/\mathrm{O}(3,3,\mathbb{Z}) \tag{5.5}$$

is a coset representative depending on 9 parameters t^α that can be regarded as the true topological coupling constants of the topological sigma model under consideration. Let us then recall the local isomorphism $\mathfrak{so}(3,3)\simeq \mathfrak{sl}(4,\mathbb{R})$ discussed in appendix B.1. As we show there, the deformations of the HyperKähler 2-forms encoded in eq.(5.4) are equivalent to deformations of the flat metric of $\mathbb{R}^4$. We can equivalently consider the space of flat metrics or the space of flat HyperKähler 2-forms on $\mathbb{R}^4$. On the other hand eq.(5.4) has a very simple interpretation. Just as in the case of the an algebraic K3 model in $d=2$, the topological coupling constants were, for the A-twisted model the parameters of the Kähler class, for the B-twisted model the parameters of the complex structure, in the case under consideration, the topological coupling constants correspond to the choice of an entire HyperKähler structure, whose space is indeed that spelled out in eq.(5.5).

For $\mathbb{L}(t)^{IJ}(t)$ one can choose various types of parameterizations, a simple one being the solvable parametrization [17], discussed in Appendix B.2. Another parametrization which is quite convenient to our goals is the classical off-diagonal one also recalled in the appendix B.3. Let us also observe that provided we are able to determine them analytically no one prevents us to consider hyperinstantons in the topological sigma model where the target space is K3, rather then $\mathbb{R}^4$. In that case eq.(5.4) would apply equally well with:

$$\mathbb{L}(t)^{IJ} \,\in\, \frac{\mathrm{SO}(3,19)}{\mathrm{SO}(3)\times \mathrm{SO}(19)}/\mathrm{O}(3,19,\mathbb{Z}) \tag{5.6}$$

instead of eq.(5.5).

6 Moduli space of the hyperinstantons, boundary conditions and the BRST complex

We come next to the conceptual questions left open in section 3 about boundary conditions and BRST invariance. In particular we address the discussion of the topological action (3.16) and the question about its role as classifier of the homotopy classes. The first key observation is the following one. When the target space is compact with a non trivial geometry, like K3, the triholomorphic constraint is a set of non-linear differential equations and multiplication of a solution by a constant does not produce a new solution. In our case where the target space has a flat geometry the triholomorphic constraint is linear and indeed, as we have shown, equivalent to Beltrami equation. This implies that if we multiply a solution by an arbitrary constant $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, the result is still a solution. Correspondingly the topological action is rescaled by λ^2. Clearly such a scale deformation of the solutions is not an interesting one from the point of view of the homotopy of the map. We are interested in those deformations that keep the topological action invariant at a fixed scale. Then by definition, the moduli space of the hyperinstantons corresponding to deformations within the same homotopy class are those that keep the topological action invariant. This choice allows to obtain BRST invariance of the action.

In this section we illustrate this issue utilizing the concrete example of the hyperinstantons in the shortest octahedral orbit $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}}$ which, as anticipated above, form a 12-parameters class. Explicitly the form of this map is the following one:

$$\begin{aligned}
q^0 &= e^{-2\pi\, n\, \mathrm{U}}\,[-\mathfrak{m}_{10}\sin(2\pi n\mathrm{X}) + \mathfrak{m}_7\cos(2\pi n\mathrm{X}) - \mathfrak{m}_{11}\sin(2\pi n\mathrm{Y}) \\
&\quad +\mathfrak{m}_8\cos(2\pi n\mathrm{Y}) - \mathfrak{m}_{12}\sin(2\pi n\mathrm{Z}) + \mathfrak{m}_9\cos(2\pi n\mathrm{Z})] \\
q^x &= e^{-2\pi\, n\, \mathrm{U}}\,[\mathfrak{m}_7\sin(2\pi n\mathrm{X}) + \mathfrak{m}_{10}\cos(2\pi n\mathrm{X}) - \mathfrak{m}_5\sin(2\pi n\mathrm{Y}) \\
&\quad +\mathfrak{m}_2\cos(2\pi n\mathrm{Y}) + \mathfrak{m}_3\sin(2\pi n\mathrm{Z}) + \mathfrak{m}_1\cos(2\pi n\mathrm{Z})] \\
q^y &= e^{-2\pi\, n\, \mathrm{U}}\,[\mathfrak{m}_6\sin(2\pi n\mathrm{X}) + \mathfrak{m}_4\cos(2\pi n\mathrm{X}) + \mathfrak{m}_8\sin(2\pi n\mathrm{Y}) \\
&\quad +\mathfrak{m}_{11}\cos(2\pi n\mathrm{Y}) + \mathfrak{m}_1(-\sin(2\pi n\mathrm{Z})) + \mathfrak{m}_3\cos(2\pi n\mathrm{Z})] \\
q^z &= e^{-2\pi\, n\, \mathrm{U}}\,[-\mathfrak{m}_4\sin(2\pi n\mathrm{X}) + \mathfrak{m}_6\cos(2\pi n\mathrm{X}) + \mathfrak{m}_2\sin(2\pi n\mathrm{Y}) \\
&\quad +\mathfrak{m}_5\cos(2\pi n\mathrm{Y}) + \mathfrak{m}_9\sin(2\pi n\mathrm{Z}) + \mathfrak{m}_{12}\cos(2\pi n\mathrm{Z})]
\end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

In order to calculate the topological action functional(4.34), we begin by defining the deformed HyperKähler forms of the target manifold. We find it convenient to utilize the off-diagonal parametrization of the coset $\mathbb{H}_{3,3}$ displayed in eq.(B.26). Naming $\Gamma = \sqrt{1+\Psi\,\Psi^T}$, the topological action has the form

$$\mathcal{A}_{top}\,[q] \;=\; \Gamma_{xy}\,\mathcal{Z}_{xy} \;+\; \Psi_{x\dot{y}}\mathcal{Z}_{x\dot{y}} \tag{6.2}$$

where we have defined:

$$\mathcal{Z}_{IJ} \;=\; \int_{\mathbb{R}_+\times \mathrm{T}^3} \alpha_I \wedge q_\star[\alpha_J] \tag{6.3}$$

Performing the explicit integrations, which are all convergent due to the exponential factor $e^{-2\pi\, n\, \mathrm{U}}$, we obtain:

$$\mathcal{A}_{top}\,[q] \;=\; 4\pi\, n\, \tfrac{1}{2}\,\mathfrak{m}^{\mathcal{I}}\,\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{J}}\,\mathfrak{m}^{\mathcal{J}} \tag{6.4}$$

where the 12×12 matrix $\mathcal{Q}$ has the explicit form given in eq.(C.1). The 12 eigenvalues of $\mathcal{Q}$ are the following ones:

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda \;=\; & 4\pi\, n \Big\{ \gamma_{1,1} - \sqrt{\psi_{1,1}^2+\psi_{1,2}^2+\psi_{1,3}^2},\; \gamma_{1,1} - \sqrt{\psi_{1,1}^2+\psi_{1,2}^2+\psi_{1,3}^2}, \\ & \gamma_{1,1} + \sqrt{\psi_{1,1}^2+\psi_{1,2}^2+\psi_{1,3}^2}, \gamma_{1,1} + \sqrt{\psi_{1,1}^2+\psi_{1,2}^2+\psi_{1,3}^2}, \\ & \gamma_{2,2} - \sqrt{\psi_{2,1}^2+\psi_{2,2}^2+\psi_{2,3}^2},\; \gamma_{2,2} - \sqrt{\psi_{2,1}^2+\psi_{2,2}^2+\psi_{2,3}^2}, \\ & \gamma_{2,2} + \sqrt{\psi_{2,1}^2+\psi_{2,2}^2+\psi_{2,3}^2},\; \gamma_{2,2} + \sqrt{\psi_{2,1}^2+\psi_{2,2}^2+\psi_{2,3}^2}, \\ & \gamma_{3,3} - \sqrt{\psi_{3,1}^2+\psi_{3,2}^2+\psi_{3,3}^2},\; \gamma_{3,3} - \sqrt{\psi_{3,1}^2+\psi_{3,2}^2+\psi_{3,3}^2}, \\ & \gamma_{3,3} + \sqrt{\psi_{3,1}^2+\psi_{3,2}^2+\psi_{3,3}^2},\; \gamma_{3,3} + \sqrt{\psi_{3,1}^2+\psi_{3,2}^2+\psi_{3,3}^2} \Big\} \end{aligned} \tag{6.5}$$

having denoted by γ_{ij} and ψ_{ij} the matrix elements of the matrices Γ and Ψ, respectively. The matrix $\mathcal{Q}$ can be put into diagonal form by an orthogonal similarity transformation:

$$\mathfrak{C}^T\, \mathcal{Q}\, \mathfrak{C} \;=\; \mathrm{diag}\,(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_{12}) \tag{6.6}$$

where the orthogonal matrix $\mathfrak{C}$ is easy to calculate but too large to be displayed. Going back to equation 6.4 we can redefine the hyperinstanton parameters as follows:

$$\mathfrak{m} \;=\; \mathfrak{C}\, \mathfrak{p} \tag{6.7}$$

and the topological action becomes:

$$\mathcal{A}_{top}\,[q] \;=\; 2\,\pi\, n \sum_{\mathcal{I}=1}^{12} \lambda_{\mathcal{I}}\, \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{I}}^2 \tag{6.8}$$

Since the matrix $\mathfrak{C}$ is orthogonal, the integration measure remains up to this stage unchanged $\mathrm{d}^{12}\mathfrak{m} = \mathrm{d}^{12}\mathfrak{p}$. The next step consists of rescaling the variables $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{I}}$, by setting:

$$\mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{I}} \;=\; \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_{\mathcal{I}}}} \mathfrak{s}_{\mathcal{I}} \tag{6.9}$$

Obviously the same replacements (6.7,6.9) have to be done in the integrand $(\ldots|\mathfrak{p}, n)$, whatever it is. As a final result of this procedure the contribution of the orbits of type $\{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}\}$ to the functional integral is turned into:

$$\text{sum on these hyperinst. of } (\ldots) \;=\; \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det \mathcal{Q}}} \int \mathrm{d}^{12}\mathfrak{s}\, \exp\left[-2\pi\, n \sum_{\mathcal{I}=1}^{12} \mathfrak{s}_{\mathcal{I}}^2 \right] \times (\ldots|\mathfrak{s}, n, \mathfrak{C}, \lambda) \tag{6.10}$$

where we have carefully specified that after the variable transformation the integrand obtains dependence on the eigenvalues λ and the entries of the orthogonal matrix $\mathfrak{C}$. If the integrand did not

depend on the degree n we might immediately perform the summation on the integers, yet this is not the case because the integrand has also an n-dependence which is not fixed a priori.

Next we have to take into account the observation we made about the scale of the map. Such a scale is encoded in the moduli $\mathfrak{s}_{\mathcal{I}}$. We set:

$$\mathfrak{s}_{\mathcal{I}} \,=\, \rho\, \mathfrak{u}_I \quad ; \quad \sum_{\mathcal{I}=1}^{12} \mathfrak{u}_{\mathcal{I}}^2 \,=\, 1 \tag{6.11}$$

The constrained u_I span a sphere $\mathbb{S}^{11}$ so that we can write:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sum on these hyp. of } (\ldots) \;&=\; \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det \mathcal{Q}}} \int_0^{\infty} d\rho \rho^{11}\, \exp\left[-2\pi\, n\, \rho^2\right] \times \int \mathrm{d}\Omega^{11}(\chi)(\ldots|\chi, n, \mathfrak{C}, \lambda) \\ &=\; \frac{15}{16\pi^6} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^6} \times \int \mathrm{d}\Omega^{11}(\chi)(\ldots|\chi, n, \mathfrak{C}, \lambda) \end{aligned} \tag{6.12}$$

where the integrand has been supposed to depend on the scale ρ as ρ^{11}. This is the same as assuming that the true hyperinstantons moduli are only the angles of $\mathbb{S}^{11}$. This assumption is formally justified in the next section.

6.1 Boundary conditions on the ghost fields

So far we have discussed the bosonic fields. The original $\mathcal{N} = 2$ σ-models contains also the fermion fields that, after the twist, become the ghost and the antighosts. The functional integral has to be done also on these fields and we have to work out their appropriate boundary conditions in order to define their functional space. To this effect let us consider the boundary term presented in equations (3.19) and (3.20). The explicit form of the three-form $\mathfrak{I}^{3,1}$ reduced to the boundary is the following one:

$$\mathfrak{I}^{3,1} \,=\, \text{const} \,\times\, K_{\mathbf{ij}}^{-|x}\, K_{uv}^{x}(t)\, c^v(\mathbf{X})\, \partial_{\mathbf{k}} q^u(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{m})\, \mathrm{dX}^{\mathbf{i}} \wedge \mathrm{dX}^{\mathbf{j}} \wedge \mathrm{dX}^{\mathbf{k}} \tag{6.13}$$

where the coordinate U has been fixed to zero, $c^v(\mathbf{X})$ is the ghost field on the T^3 boundary, the indices $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k}$ run on the three values x, y, z while the indices u, v run on the 4 values $0, x, y, z$. BRST-invariance of the topological action requires that the integral of $\mathfrak{I}^{3,1}$ on the boundary should be zero. This is a clear-cut functional constraint on the ghost fields. At first sight it seems a rather complicated condition, yet in the semiclassical approximation utilized in topological field theories it becomes rather simple.

We just follow the discussion presented in the book [16] at page 316, eq.(7.7.60) and following ones. In the background of a hyperinstanton $q^u(\mathrm{U}, \mathbf{X}|\mathfrak{m})$, the ghost field can be expanded as follows:

$$c^u(\mathrm{U}, \mathbf{X}) \,=\, \sum_{\alpha=1}^{\Delta} \theta^{\alpha}\, \delta q_{\alpha}^u(\mathrm{U}, \mathbf{X}|\mathfrak{m})) \,+\, \delta c^u(\mathrm{U}, \mathbf{X}) \tag{6.14}$$

where δc^u are higher modes (not satisfying the triholomorphic constraint) while $\delta q_{\alpha}^u(\mathrm{U}, \mathbf{X}, |\mathfrak{m}))$ are a basis of zero-modes, namely a set solutions of the triholomorphic equation that furthermore satisfy

the boundary condition (6.13) in the background of the hyperinstanton $q^u(\mathrm{U}, \mathbf{X}, |\mathfrak{m}))$. Because of the linearity of the triholomorphic constraint we can write:

$$\delta q^u_\alpha(\mathrm{U}, \mathbf{X}, |\mathfrak{m}) \;=\; \kappa^{\mathcal{I}}_\alpha \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathfrak{m}^{\mathcal{I}}} q^u_\alpha(\mathrm{U}, \mathbf{X}, |\mathfrak{m}) \tag{6.15}$$

where $\kappa^{\mathcal{I}}_\alpha$ is a set of Δ 12-vectors such that the constraint (6.13) is satisfied by the ghost zero mode. Inserting the expression (6.15) in the condition (6.13) and performing the integrals we obtain:

$$\mathfrak{m}^{\mathcal{I}}\, \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{J}}\, \kappa^{\mathcal{J}}_\alpha \;=\; 0 \tag{6.16}$$

The number of solutions of the algebraic equation (6.16) is obviously 11 and the best way of solving the equation is by setting:

$$\kappa_\alpha \;=\; \rho\, \mathfrak{C}\, \mathcal{D}\, \frac{\partial}{\partial \chi^\alpha} \mathfrak{u}(\chi) \tag{6.17}$$

where:

$$\mathcal{D} \;=\; \mathrm{diag}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_1}}, \ldots, \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_{12}}} \right) \tag{6.18}$$

and $\frac{\partial}{\partial \chi^\alpha}$ is the derivative with respect to the Euler angles parameterizing the $\mathbb{S}^{11}$ sphere. As explained in [16] the Berezin integration on the fermionic variables θ^α replaces them with the associated differential $\mathrm{d}\chi^\alpha$ and the final outcome of the story is that the appropriate ghost fields that satisfy the boundary conditions and give BRST invariance of the action are:

$$\begin{aligned} c^u \;&=\; \mathrm{d}\chi^\alpha \frac{\partial}{\partial \chi^\alpha} q^u(\mathrm{U}, \mathbf{X}|\mathfrak{m}(\rho, \chi)) \\ &=\; \rho\, \mathrm{d}\chi^\alpha \frac{\partial}{\partial \chi^\alpha} q^u(\mathrm{U}, \mathbf{X}|\mathfrak{m}(1, \chi)) \end{aligned} \tag{6.19}$$

The topological observables are linear functions of the ghost fields and hence 1-forms on the sphere $\mathbb{S}^{11}$. The only possible correlator is the top-form of degree eleven and the assumption on the dependence ρ^{11} of the integrand is demonstrated.

7 Summary and Conclusions

We reconsidered triholomoprhic maps from a four dimensional HyperKähler space to a 4-dimensional target HK space motivated by the intriguing correspondence between the Beltrami equation, the triholomorphic maps and the hyperinstantons. We used such a relation to count the number of solutions (and their deformations or, in other words, their moduli) by means of the localization of the path integral around triholomorphic maps. We showed that in a 4d worldvolume space a twisting procedure can be performed along the ways of the topological 2d sigma models and that it gives us some very powerful computational means to understand the (quantum) geometry of the solutions to the Beltrami equation. This paper is the starting point for a more ambitious goal of computing

the complete range of solutions to the Beltrami equation by studying the topological correlators of a sigma model.

Combining the role of Beltrami vector fields as fluxes in 2-brane solutions of $D = 7$ supergravity with their reinterpretation as building blocks of hyperinstantons opens the perspective of relating hyperinstantons to supergravity 2-branes which is quite challenging and will be the object of further investigations.

A Complex structure of the hyperinstantons

To appreciate the precise nature of the hyperinstanton triholomorphicity equations and of the topological action it is convenient to go to a complex basis. Although our goal is the specific choice $\mathcal{N}_4 = \mathbb{R}^4$ for the target manifold, in the present discussion we maintain the choice of the latter arbitrary in order to emphasize the formal structure of the hyperinstantons.

We adopt the following conventions. The hyperKähler structures on the base manifold and on the target manifold are respectively chosen as follows:

$$\begin{array}{|lcl|lcl|}\hline \omega^{(2,0)} &=& \frac{\mathbf{k}^2+\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}^1}{\sqrt{2}} & \Omega^{(2,0)} &=& \frac{\mathbf{K}^2+\mathrm{i}\mathbf{K}^1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \omega^{(0,2)} &=& \frac{\mathbf{k}^2-\mathrm{i}\mathbf{k}^1}{\sqrt{2}} & \Omega^{(0,2)} &=& \frac{\mathbf{K}^2-\mathrm{i}\mathbf{K}^1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \omega^{(1,1)} &=& \mathbf{k}^3 & \Omega^{(1,1)} &=& \mathbf{K}^3 \\ \hline \end{array} \tag{A.1}$$

where $\mathbf{k}^x$ is the triplet of antiself-dual 2-forms on the base manifold associated with the triplet of complex structures forming the quaternionic algebra and $\mathbf{K}^x$ is the analogous triplet of anti-self-dual 2-forms on the target manifold. On the base manifold we choose the complex coordinates according to the complex structure implicitly implied by the choice (A.6), namely we set:

$$\begin{array}{rclcrcl} z^1 &=& \mathrm{Z}+\mathrm{iU} &;& z^2 &=& \mathrm{Y}-\mathrm{iX} \\ \overline{z}^{1^\star} &=& \mathrm{Z}-\mathrm{iU} &;& \overline{z}^{2^\star} &=& \mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{iX} \end{array} \tag{A.2}$$

and we obtain:

$$\begin{array}{rcccl} \omega^{(2,0)} &=& -2\,\mathrm{i}\,\mathrm{d}z^1\wedge\mathrm{d}z^2 &=& -\,\mathrm{i}\,\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}\mathrm{d}z^\alpha\wedge\mathrm{d}z^\beta \\ \omega^{(0,2)} &=& 2\,\mathrm{i}\,\mathrm{d}\overline{z}^{\overline{1}}\wedge\mathrm{d}\overline{z}^{\overline{2}} &=& \mathrm{i}\,\epsilon_{\overline{\alpha}\overline{\beta}}\mathrm{d}\overline{z}^{\overline{\alpha}}\wedge\mathrm{d}\overline{z}^{\overline{\beta}} \\ \omega^{(1,1)} &=& \mathrm{i}\left(dz^1\wedge d\overline{z}^{\overline{1}}+dz^2\wedge d\overline{z}^{\overline{2}}\right) &=& \mathrm{i}\,\delta_{\alpha\overline{\beta}}\mathrm{d}z^\alpha\wedge\mathrm{d}\overline{z}^{\overline{\beta}} \end{array} \tag{A.3}$$

Similarly let us introduce a set of complex coordinates on the target manifold well-adapted to the complex structure implicitly implied by the choice (A.6). We name them

$$q^j \quad ; \quad \overline{q}^{\overline{j}} \quad ; \quad j = 1,2,\ldots,2m \quad \text{for } \dim\mathcal{N} = 4\,m \tag{A.4}$$

Using these coordinates we necessarily obtain:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \Omega^{(2,0)} &=& \Omega_{ij}\,\mathrm{d}q^i\wedge\mathrm{d}q^j \\ \Omega^{(0,2)} &=& \overline{\Omega}_{\overline{i}\overline{j}}\,\mathrm{d}\overline{q}^{\overline{i}}\wedge\mathrm{d}\overline{q}^{\overline{j}} \\ \Omega^{(1,1)} &=& \mathrm{i}\,g_{i\overline{j}}\,\mathrm{d}q^i\wedge\mathrm{d}\overline{q}^{\overline{j}} \end{array} \tag{A.5}$$

where $g_{i\overline{j}}$ is the HyperKähler metric of the target manifold, which, in particular, is Kähler.

Having fixed these conventions one easily retrieves the forms of the three complex structures arranged according to:

$$\begin{array}{|lcl|lcl|}\hline j^+ &=& \frac{j^2+\mathrm{i}j^1}{\sqrt{2}} & J^+ &=& \frac{J^2+\mathrm{i}J^1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ j^- &=& \frac{j^2-\mathrm{i}j^1}{\sqrt{2}} & J^- &=& \frac{J^2-\mathrm{i}J^1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ j^0 &=& j^3 & J^0 &=& J^3 \\ \hline \end{array} \tag{A.6}$$

and one explicitly obtains:

$$\begin{array}{rclcrclcrclcrcl} (j^+)_\alpha{}^{\overline{\beta}} & = & -\,\mathrm{i}\,\epsilon_\alpha{}^{\overline{\beta}} & , & (j^+)_{\overline{\alpha}}{}^{\beta} & = & 0 & , & (j^-)_{\overline{\alpha}}{}^{\beta} & = & \mathrm{i}\,\epsilon_{\overline{\alpha}}{}^{\beta} & , & (j^-)_\alpha{}^{\overline{\beta}} & = & 0 \\ (j^0)_\alpha{}^{\overline{\beta}} & = & 0 & , & (j^0)_{\overline{\alpha}}{}^{\beta} & = & 0 & , & (j^0)_\alpha{}^{\beta} & = & \mathrm{i}\delta_\alpha{}^{\beta} & , & (j^0)_{\overline{\alpha}}{}^{\overline{\beta}} & = & -\,\mathrm{i}\delta_{\overline{\alpha}}{}^{\overline{\beta}} \end{array} \tag{A.7}$$

for the base manifold and:

$$\begin{array}{rclcrclcrclcrcl} (J^+)_i{}^{\bar{\jmath}} & = & -\,\mathrm{i}\,\Omega_i{}^{\bar{\jmath}} & , & (J^+)_{\bar{\imath}}{}^{j} & = & 0 & , & (J^-)_{\bar{\imath}}{}^{j} & = & \mathrm{i}\,\overline{\Omega}_{\bar{\imath}}{}^{j} & , & (J^-)_i{}^{\bar{\jmath}} & = & 0 \\ (J^0)_i{}^{\bar{\jmath}} & = & 0 & , & (J^0)_{\bar{\imath}}{}^{j} & = & 0 & , & (J^0)_i{}^{j} & = & \mathrm{i}\delta_i{}^{j} & , & (J^0)_{\bar{\imath}}{}^{\bar{\jmath}} & = & -\,\mathrm{i}\delta_{\bar{\imath}}{}^{\bar{\jmath}} \end{array} \tag{A.8}$$

for the target manifold. In the above eq.(A.8) we have defined:

$$\Omega_i{}^{\bar{\jmath}} \,=\, \Omega_{i\ell}\, g^{\ell\bar{\jmath}} \quad ; \quad \overline{\Omega}_{\bar{\imath}}{}^{j} \,=\, \Omega_{\bar{\imath}\bar{\ell}}\, g^{\bar{\ell}j} \tag{A.9}$$

Using this complex coordinate basis, the triholomorphicity conditions $\mathcal{E}^u_\mu = 0$ defined by eq.(3.9) become the following ones:

$$\partial_{\overline{\alpha}}\, q^i \;=\; 0 \tag{A.10}$$

$$\partial_\alpha\, q^i \;=\; -\,\mathrm{i}\,\tfrac{1}{2}\,\epsilon_\alpha{}^{\overline{\beta}}\,\partial_{\overline{\beta}}\,\overline{q}^{\bar{\ell}}\,\overline{\Omega}_{\ell}{}^{i} \tag{A.11}$$

plus the complex conjugates of the above.

Equations (A.10,A.11) are quite revealing. The first of them (A.10) tells us that any triholomorphic map is in particular holomorphic. The second constraint relates the holomorphic derivatives of the holomorphic coordinates to the anti-holomorphic derivatives of the anti-holomorphic coordinates through the unique $\Omega^{(2,0)}$ form of the target manifold. From (A.10,A.11) another property is also immediately evident. If q^i depends holomorphically only from one of the two coordinates of the base manifold then the triholomorphicity conditions are automatically satisfied. Hence any holomorphic embedding of a two dimensional subspace of the 4-dimensional base manifold into the target manifold is triholomorphic. This means that all instantons of $2D$ sigma-model are included in the space of hyperinstantons of the 4D sigma-model. A quite relevant inclusion!

Let us next consider the transcription of topological action (3.16) into complex formalism. Setting $\mathrm{O} = 1$ as already explained we obtain:

$$\mathcal{A}_{top}[q,t] \;=\; \int_{\mathcal{M}_4} \left(\omega^{(2,0)} \wedge q_\star\left[\Omega^{(0,2)}(t)\right] \,+\, \omega^{(0,2)} \wedge q_\star\left[\Omega^{(2,0)}(t)\right] \omega^{(1,1)} \wedge q_\star\left[\Omega^{(1,1)}(t)\right]\right) \tag{A.12}$$

where t denote the $3 \times n_+$ parameters of the manifold of HyperKähler structure deformations:

$$\mathcal{M}_{HK} \,=\, \frac{\mathrm{SO}(3,\mathrm{n}_+)}{\mathrm{SO}(3)\times\mathrm{SO}(\mathrm{n}_+)}/\mathrm{O}(3,\mathrm{n}_+,\mathbb{Z}) \tag{A.13}$$

n_+ being the number of self-dual 2-forms which is 3 for $\mathbb{R}^4$ and 19 for K3. In equation (A.12) we have emphasized that the HyperKähler form depend on their moduli.

Relying on eq.(5.4) the topological action can be rewritten also in an equivalent way where the dependence of the moduli-parameters becomes explicit:

$$\mathcal{A}_{top}[q,t] \;=\; \mathbb{L}_x{}^J(t) \times \int_{\mathcal{M}_4} \mathbf{k}^x \wedge q_\star\,[\alpha_J] \tag{A.14}$$

This way of rewriting the topological action is very useful in order to discuss the right choice of the topological observables.

B About the coset $\mathrm{SO}(3,3)/\mathrm{SO}(3)\times\mathrm{SO}(3)$

The group $\mathrm{SO}(3,3)$ corresponds to the maximal non-compact real form of the Lie algebra $\mathrm{A}_3 \sim \mathrm{D}_3$. It follows that $\mathrm{SO}(3,3)$ is locally isomorphic to $\mathrm{SL}(4,\mathbb{R})$. Indeed $\mathrm{SL}(4,\mathbb{R})$ is just the spinor representation of $\mathrm{SO}(3,3)$. Clearly this implies that:

$$\mathbb{H}_{3,3} \;\equiv\; \frac{\mathrm{SO}(3,3)}{\mathrm{SO}(3)\times\mathrm{SO}(3)} \;\simeq\; \frac{\mathrm{SL}(4,\mathbb{R})}{\mathrm{SO}(4)} \tag{B.1}$$

Hence the coset manifold we are interested in can be alternatively viewed as the space of all 3×3 matrices $\mathfrak{T}$, or as the space of symmetric 4×4, matrices h with determinant one.

B.1 The $\mathrm{SO}(3,3)\sim\mathrm{SL}(4,\mathrm{R})$ isomorphism, flat metrics and HyperKähler structures

The aforementioned local isomorphism has a clearcut geometrical interpretation that is quite relevant in the context of the topological field theory we consider. On one side, as we have seen in eq.s (2.43,2.44) and (5.5,5.4), the elements of the coset $\frac{\mathrm{SO}(3,3)}{\mathrm{SO}(3)\times\mathrm{SO}(3)}$ parameterize the deformations of the flat HyperKähler structures of $\mathbb{R}^4$. On the other hand the 4×4 symmetric matrices with determinant one parameterize the space of flat constant metrics with unit volume. This observation provides the means of geometrically constructing the isomorphism spelled out above.

Let us consider the reference flat metric $h^0_{uv} = \delta_{uv}$ and the reference pair of quaternionic algebras of tri-complex structures, provided, by the antiself-dual and antiself-dual 't Hooft matrices $J^x_0 = J^{-|x}$, $J^{\dot{x}}_0 = J^{+|\dot{x}}$:

$$\begin{aligned} J^x_0\, J^y_0 &= -\,\delta^{xy}\,\mathbf{1} \,+\, \epsilon^{xyz}\, J^y_0 \\ J^{\dot{x}}_0\, J^{\dot{y}}_0 &= -\,\delta^{\dot{x}\dot{y}}\,\mathbf{1} \,+\, \epsilon^{\dot{x}\dot{y}\dot{z}}\, J^{\dot{y}}_0 \end{aligned} \tag{B.2}$$

The indices of the complex structure are the first up, the second down, since, by definition, they are maps of the tangent bundle into itself. From the pair of tri-complex structures we obtain the pair of HyperKähler forms by lowering the first index with the metric:

$$K^{0|I}_{uv} \;=\; h^0_{us}\,\left(J^I_0\right)^s{}_v \quad ; \quad \mathbf{K}^{0|I} \;=\; K^{0|I}_{uv}\,\mathrm{d}q^u\wedge\mathrm{d}q^v \qquad I=\{x,\dot{x}\} \tag{B.3}$$

Let us next consider a generic constant flat metric h_{uv} with the same signature and determinant one. It can be written as follows:

$$h \,=\, S^T\, h_0\, S \quad ; \quad S \,\in\, \mathrm{SL}(4,\mathbb{R}) \tag{B.4}$$

Clearly S and $S' \,=\, S\, O$ with $O \in \mathrm{SO}(4)$ give rise to the same flat metric, which shows that $\frac{\mathrm{SL}(4,\mathbb{R})}{\mathrm{SO}(4)}$ is the space of all metrics h_{uv} on $\mathbb{R}^4$. The writing (B.4) leads to conclude that:

$$J^I \,=\, S^{-1}\, J_0^I\, S \tag{B.5}$$

is the new pair of tri-complex structures satisfying the same quaternionic algebras:

$$\begin{aligned} J^x\, J^y \;&=\; -\,\delta^{xy}\,\mathbf{1} \,+\, \epsilon^{xyz}\, J^y \\ J^{\dot{x}}\, J^{\dot{y}} \;&=\; -\,\delta^{\dot{x}\dot{y}}\,\mathbf{1} \,+\, \epsilon^{\dot{x}\dot{y}\dot{z}}\, J^{\dot{y}} \end{aligned} \tag{B.6}$$

on $\mathbb{R}^4$ endowed with the metric h_{uv}. Lowering the first index of the new pair of tri-complex structures with the metric h we obtain the new pair of HyperKähler forms:

$$K^I \,=\, S^T\, K^{0|I}\, S \quad ; \quad \mathbf{K}^I \,=\, K^I_{uv}\, \mathrm{d}q^u \wedge \mathrm{d}q^v \tag{B.7}$$

Next calculating the intersection product of the new pair of HyperKähler forms, we obtain:

$$\mathbf{K}^I \wedge \mathbf{K}^J \,=\, (\mathrm{det}S) \times \mathbf{K}^I_0 \wedge \mathbf{K}^J_0 \,=\, (\mathrm{det}S)\; 8 \,\times\, \eta_{IJ}\, \mathrm{Vol} \tag{B.8}$$

Hence as long as the determinant of the matrix S is one, the intersection matrix of the K-forms is preserved. Since K^I_{uv} are anyhow antisymmetric 4×4 matrices, they can be linearly expanded on the basis of such matrices provided by the 't Hooft ones. This yields

$$K^I \,=\, L^I{}_J\, K^{0|J} \,=\, S^T\, K^{0|I}\, S \quad ; \quad L \,\in\, \mathrm{SO}(3,3) \tag{B.9}$$

which is the explicit form of the local isomorphism and provides also the algorithm to construct explicitly L starting from S. The locality of the isomorphism is clear from the fact that S and $-\,S$ yield the same L.

B.2 The solvable parameterization and fractional linear transformations

It is useful to recall that the group $\mathrm{SO}(\overline{\mathrm{n}},\overline{\mathrm{n}})$ works also as the group of electric-magnetic duality rotation on a set of n field strengths that are $(2p+1)$-forms in dimensions $D = 4p+2$ just as the symplectic group $\mathrm{Sp}(\overline{\mathrm{n}},\overline{\mathrm{n}})$ does the same job on n field strengths that are $2p$-forms in dimensions $D = 4p$ [18]. This fact provides the proper setup to parameterize the coset manifold (B.1) in terms of a 3×3 matrix with nice fractional linear transformation under $\mathrm{SO}(3,3)$. Suppose we had some theory of gauge 2-forms in six dimensions and that the number of such gauge forms were precisely three. Then, calling $\mathbf{F}^{[3]}_I$ the corresponding 3-form field strengths we would have the following lagrangian:

$$\mathcal{L} \,=\, \gamma_{IJ}(\phi)\, \mathbf{F}^I_{[3]} \wedge \star_g \mathbf{F}^J_{[3]} \,+\, \theta_{IJ}(\phi)\, \mathbf{F}^I_{[3]} \wedge \mathbf{F}^J_{[3]} \tag{B.10}$$

where $\star_g$ denotes the Hodge dual with respect to the space-time metric and $\gamma_{IJ}(\phi)$ and $\theta(\phi)$ are two 3×3 matrices respectively symmetric and antisymmetric that depend on the scalar fields included in the theory. As shown in [18] the most general electric-magnetic duality rotations mixing field equations and Bianchi identities that are admitted by the above theory are described in the following way. Define the matrix:

$$\mathfrak{T}(\phi) \equiv \gamma_{IJ}(\phi) + \theta_{IJ}(\phi) \tag{B.11}$$

and consider a generic $\mathrm{SO}(3,3)$-matrix:

$$\left(\begin{array}{c|c} A & B \\ \hline C & D \end{array}\right) \equiv \Lambda_{dual} \in \mathrm{SO}(3,3) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \Lambda_{dual}^{T} \left(\begin{array}{c|c} 0 & \mathbf{1}_{3\times 3} \\ \hline \mathbf{1}_{3\times 3} & 0 \end{array}\right) \Lambda_{dual} = \underbrace{\left(\begin{array}{c|c} 0 & \mathbf{1}_{3\times 3} \\ \hline \mathbf{1}_{3\times 3} & 0 \end{array}\right)}_{\eta_{dual}} \tag{B.12}$$

then the most general electric-magnetic duality rotation is represented on the matrix $\mathfrak{T}(\phi)$ by the following linear fractional transformation:

$$\gamma'_{IJ} + \theta'_{IJ} \equiv \mathfrak{T}' = (A\,\mathfrak{T} + B)\,(C\,\mathfrak{T} + D)^{-1} \tag{B.13}$$

For this reason in this section we consider three alternative forms of the $\mathfrak{so}(3,3)$ invariant metric, namely:

$$\eta_{solv} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad ; \quad \eta_{diag} = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\eta_{dual} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{B.14}$$

They are related one to the other by the following transformations:

$$\eta_{diag} = \mathrm{M}^T \eta_{solv} \mathrm{M} \quad ; \quad \mathrm{M} = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\eta_{dual} = \mathrm{N}^T \eta_{diag} \mathrm{N} \quad ; \quad \mathrm{N} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \tag{B.15}$$

Correspondingly the group elements of $\mathrm{SO}(3,3)$ are alternatively defined by one of the three quadratic constraints:

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda \in \mathrm{SO}(3,3) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad & \Lambda_{solv}^T \eta_{solv} \Lambda_{solv} = \eta_{solv} \quad ; \quad \Lambda_{diag}^T \eta_{diag} \Lambda_{diag} = \eta_{diag} \\ & \Lambda_{dual}^T \eta_{dual} \Lambda_{dual} = \eta_{dual} \end{aligned} \tag{B.16}$$

and the relation between the explicit form of the same group element in the three bases is given below:

$$\Lambda_{diag} = \mathrm{M}^{-1} \Lambda_{solv} \mathrm{M} \quad ; \quad \Lambda_{dual} = \mathrm{N}^{-1} \Lambda_{diag} \mathrm{N} \tag{B.17}$$

Recalling eq.s (2.43,2.44) we see that the basis where the $\mathfrak{so}(3,3)$ metric is diagonal is the natural one for the cohomology lattice since $8 \times \eta_{diag}$ is the intersection form of $\mathbb{R}^4$. On the other hand the solvable basis where the $\mathfrak{so}(3,3)$ metric has an anti-diagonal form is the best suited to derive the solvable parametrization of the non compact coset under consideration. Indeed, according to a well established mathematical theory [17], a maximally non-compact coset such as ours is metrically equivalent to a solvable group-manifold, in particular to the exponential map of the Borel subalgebra. In the solvable basis where the invariant metric is given by η_{solv}, the Borel subalgebra $\mathfrak{B}\left[\mathfrak{so}(3,3)\right]$ is composed by upper triangular matrices and its exponentiation is particularly simple.

The most general element of the Borel subalgebra in the solvable basis is the following one:

$$\mathbf{B}_a \,=\, \sum_i^9 t_i \,\mathrm{B}_a^i \,=\, \begin{pmatrix} h_1 & \tau_1 & \tau_3 & \tau_5 & \tau_6 & 0 \\ 0 & h_2 & \tau_2 & \tau_4 & 0 & -\tau_6 \\ 0 & 0 & h_3 & 0 & -\tau_4 & -\tau_5 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -h_3 & -\tau_2 & -\tau_3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -h_2 & -\tau_1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -h_1 \end{pmatrix} \tag{B.18}$$

where we have introduced the set of 9 parameters:

$$t_i \,=\, \{h_1, h_2, h_3, \tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4, \tau_5, \tau_6\} \tag{B.19}$$

the generator B_a^i being the matrix coefficient of the corresponding parameter in the expansion of $\mathbf{B}_a$. The first three parameters $h_{1,2,3}$ correspond to the Cartan generators while the remaining six parameters τ_i correspond to the six positive roots of the $\mathfrak{so}(3,3)$ Lie algebra.

Next we can introduce the coset representative in the solvable basis by setting:

$$\mathbb{L}_a(t) \,=\, \prod_i^9 \exp\left[t_i \mathrm{B}_a^i\right] \,=\, \exp\left[t_1 \mathrm{B}_a^1\right] \ldots \exp\left[t_9 \mathrm{B}_a^9\right] \tag{B.20}$$

and the explicit result is the following one:

$$\mathbb{L}_{solv}(t) \,=$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} e^{h_1} & e^{h_1}\tau_1 & e^{h_1}\left(\tau_1\tau_2+\tau_3\right) & e^{h_1}\left(\tau_1\tau_4+\tau_5\right) & e^{h_1}\left(\tau_6-\left(\tau_1\tau_2+\tau_3\right)\tau_4\right) & -e^{h_1}\left(\tau_3\tau_5+\tau_1\left(\tau_2\tau_5+\tau_6\right)\right) \\ 0 & e^{h_2} & e^{h_2}\tau_2 & e^{h_2}\tau_4 & -e^{h_2}\tau_2\tau_4 & -e^{h_2}\left(\tau_2\tau_5+\tau_6\right) \\ 0 & 0 & e^{h_3} & 0 & -e^{h_3}\tau_4 & -e^{h_3}\tau_5 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & e^{-h_3} & -e^{-h_3}\tau_2 & -e^{-h_3}\tau_3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & e^{-h_2} & -e^{-h_2}\tau_1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & e^{-h_1} \end{pmatrix} \tag{B.21}$$

Transformed to the dual basis the coset representative $\mathbb{L}_{solv}(t)$ takes the following form:

$$\mathbb{L}_{dual}(t) =$$

$$\left(\begin{array}{ccc|ccc} e^{h_1} & e^{h_1}\tau_1 & e^{h_1}\left(\tau_1\tau_2+\tau_3\right) & -e^{h_1}\left(\tau_3\tau_5+\tau_1\left(\tau_2\tau_5+\tau_6\right)\right) & e^{h_1}\left(\tau_6-\left(\tau_1\tau_2+\tau_3\right)\tau_4\right) & e^{h_1}\left(\tau_1\tau_4+\tau_5\right) \\ 0 & e^{h_2} & e^{h_2}\tau_2 & -e^{h_2}\left(\tau_2\tau_5+\tau_6\right) & -e^{h_2}\tau_2\tau_4 & e^{h_2}\tau_4 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{h_3} & -e^{h_3}\tau_5 & -e^{h_3}\tau_4 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & e^{-h_1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -e^{-h_2}\tau_1 & e^{-h_2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -e^{-h_3}\tau_3 & -e^{-h_3}\tau_2 & e^{-h_3} \end{array}\right)$$

(B.22)

where we easily recognize the blocks $A(t)$,$B(t)$,$C(t)$ and $D(t)$. Given this form we can reconstruct the parameterization of the coset by means of a matrix $\mathfrak{T}$ regarding it as the fractional linear transform of the identity matrix, namely setting:

$$\mathfrak{T}(t) \,=\, (A(t)\,\mathbf{1}_{3\times 3} \,+\, B)\,(C(t)\,\mathbf{1}_{3\times 3} \,+\, D(t))^{-1} \tag{B.23}$$

The result is encoded in the following:

$$\mathfrak{T}(t) \,=$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} e^{2h_1}\left(\left(\tau_2^2+1\right)\tau_1^2+2\tau_2\tau_3\tau_1+\tau_3^2+1\right) & e^{h_1+h_2}\left(\tau_1\left(\tau_2^2+1\right)-\tau_3\tau_4+\tau_2\left(\tau_3+\tau_5\right)+\tau_6\right) & e^{h_1+h_3}\left(\tau_3+\tau_1\left(\tau_2+\tau_4\right)+\tau_5\right) \\ e^{h_1+h_2}\left(\tau_1\left(\tau_2^2+1\right)+\tau_3\left(\tau_2+\tau_4\right)-\tau_2\tau_5-\tau_6\right) & e^{2h_2}\left(\tau_2^2+1\right) & e^{h_2+h_3}\left(\tau_2+\tau_4\right) \\ e^{h_1+h_3}\left(\tau_3+\tau_1\left(\tau_2-\tau_4\right)-\tau_5\right) & e^{h_2+h_3}\left(\tau_2-\tau_4\right) & e^{2h_3} \end{pmatrix} \tag{B.24}$$

which provides the relation between the solvable parameterization of the coset and its projective parameterization in terms of a matrix $\mathfrak{T}$. What we learn from this example is that in what we called the dual basis a coset representative that transforms the unit matrix into a generic $\mathfrak{T}$ can be chosen upper triangular. Indeed with reference to eq.(B.11) we can set:

$$\mathbb{L}(\mathfrak{T}) \,\in\, \mathrm{SO}(3,3) \quad ; \quad \mathbb{L}(\mathfrak{T}) \,=\, \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \gamma^{\frac{1}{2}} & \theta\,\gamma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\ \hline 0 & \gamma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \end{array}\right) \tag{B.25}$$

B.3 The off-diagonal parameterization

Another very elegant and symmetric parametrization that has just the inconvenience of involving non polynomial matrix functions is the classical off-diagonal one. In the diagonal basis the $\mathbb{H}_{3,3}$ coset representative can be written as:

$$\mathbb{L}_{diag}(\Psi)\,\left(\begin{array}{c|c} \sqrt{1+\Psi\,\Psi^T} & \Psi \\ \hline \Psi^T & \sqrt{1+\Psi^T\,\Psi} \end{array}\right) \tag{B.26}$$

where Ψ is a generic 3×3 matrix that encodes all the 9 parameters of the coset.

C Some large formulas

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{J}} = \begin{pmatrix}
\gamma_{3,3}-\psi_{3,3} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\psi_{3,2} & 0 & 0 & \psi_{3,1} \\
0 & \gamma_{2,2}+\psi_{2,2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\psi_{2,3} & 0 & 0 & -\psi_{2,1} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \gamma_{3,3}-\psi_{3,3} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \psi_{3,1} & 0 & 0 & \psi_{3,2} \\
0 & 0 & 0 & \gamma_{1,1}-\psi_{1,1} & 0 & 0 & -\psi_{1,3} & 0 & 0 & \psi_{1,2} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \gamma_{2,2}+\psi_{2,2} & 0 & 0 & \psi_{2,1} & 0 & 0 & -\psi_{2,3} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \gamma_{1,1}-\psi_{1,1} & \psi_{1,2} & 0 & 0 & \psi_{1,3} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & -\psi_{1,3} & 0 & \psi_{1,2} & \gamma_{1,1}+\psi_{1,1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & -\psi_{2,3} & 0 & 0 & \psi_{2,1} & 0 & 0 & \gamma_{2,2}-\psi_{2,2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
-\psi_{3,2} & 0 & \psi_{3,1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \gamma_{3,3}+\psi_{3,3} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & \psi_{1,2} & 0 & \psi_{1,3} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \gamma_{1,1}+\psi_{1,1} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & -\psi_{2,1} & 0 & 0 & -\psi_{2,3} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \gamma_{2,2}-\psi_{2,2} & 0 \\
\psi_{3,1} & 0 & \psi_{3,2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \gamma_{3,3}+\psi_{3,3}
\end{pmatrix} \tag{C.1}$$

References

[1] P. Fre and A. S. Sorin, *2-branes with Arnold-Beltrami Fluxes from Minimal D=7 Supergravity*, arXiv:1504.06802 [hep-th].

[2] P.K. Townsend and P. van Nieuwenhuizen *Gauged Seven Dimensional Supergravity* Phys. Lett. **B125** (1983), 41

[3] Abdus Salm and E. Sezgin *SO(4) Gauging of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supergravity in seven dimensions* Phys. Lett. **B126** (1983), 295

[4] E.Bergshoeff, I.G. Koh and E. Sezgin *Yang-Mills Einstein supergravity in seven dimensions* Phys. Rev. D, **32**, 6, (1985) 1353.

[5] E. Beltrami, Opere matematiche, **4** (1889) 304.

[6] P. Fre and A. S. Sorin, *Classification of Arnold-Beltrami Flows and their Hidden Symmetries*, arXiv:1501.04604 [math-ph].

[7] V. I. Arnold, *On the evolution of a magnetic feld under the action of transport and diffusion*, in *Vladimir I. Arnold: Collected Works, Volume II, Hydrodynamics, Bifurcation Theory, and Algebraic Geometry 1965-1972* (Edited by Alexander B. Givental, Boris A. Khesin, Alexander N. Varchenko, Victor A. Vassiliev, Oleg Ya. Viro), 405 - 419, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2014. Originally published in: *Some Problems in Modern Analysis*, 8-21 (Russian), Izd. MGU, Moscow 1984.

[8] The ABC flows have been discovered by Gromeka in 1881, rediscovered by Beltrami [5], and proposed for study in the present context in [7] and [9].

[9] S. Childress, *Construction of steady-state hydromagnetic dynamos. I. Spatially periodic fields*, Report MF-53, Courant Inst. of Math. Sci. (1967); *New solutions of the kinematic dynamo problem*, J. Math. Phys. **11** (1970) 3063 - 3076.

[10] D. Anselmi and P. Fre, *Topological sigma models in four-dimensions and triholomorphic maps*, Nucl. Phys. B **416** (1994) 255 [hep-th/9306080].

[11] L. Andrianopoli, M. Bertolini, A. Ceresole, R. D'Auria, S. Ferrara, P. Fre and T. Magri, *'N=2 supergravity and N=2 superYang-Mills theory on general scalar manifolds: Symplectic covariance, gaugings and the momentum map,* J. Geom. Phys. **23** (1997) 111 [hep-th/9605032].

[12] D. Anselmi and P. Fre, *Twisted N=2 supergravity as topological gravity in four-dimensions*, Nucl. Phys. B **392** (1993) 401 [hep-th/9208029].

[13] D. Anselmi and P. Fre, *Topological twist in four-dimensions, R duality and hyperinstantons*, Nucl. Phys. B **404** (1993) 288 [hep-th/9211121].

[14] D. Anselmi and P. Fre, *Gauged hyper - instantons and monopole equations*, Phys. Lett. B **347** (1995) 247 [hep-th/9411205].

[15] P. Fayet and S. Ferrara, *Supersymmetry*, Phys. Rept. **32** (1977) 249.

[16] P. Fre and P. Soriani, *The N=2 wonderland: From Calabi-Yau manifolds to topological field theories*, Singapore, Singapore: World Scientific (1995) 468 p

[17] P. Fre and A. S. Sorin, *Supergravity Black Holes and Billiards and Liouville integrable structure of dual Borel algebras* JHEP **1003** (2010) 066 [arXiv:0903.2559 [hep-th]].
P. Fre, V. Gili, F. Gargiulo, A. S. Sorin, K. Rulik and M. Trigiante, *Cosmological backgrounds of superstring theory and solvable algebras: Oxidation and branes* Nucl. Phys. B **685** (2004) 3 [hep-th/0309237].
L. Andrianopoli, R. D'Auria, S. Ferrara, P. Fre and M. Trigiante, *E(7)(7) duality, BPS black hole evolution and fixed scalars* Nucl. Phys. B **509** (1998) 463 [hep-th/9707087].
L. Andrianopoli, R. D'Auria, S. Ferrara, P. Fre, R. Minasian and M. Trigiante, *Solvable Lie algebras in type IIA, type IIB and M theories,* Nucl. Phys. B **493** (1997) 249 [hep-th/9612202].
L. Andrianopoli, R. D'Auria, S. Ferrara, P. Fre and M. Trigiante, *RR scalars, U duality and solvable Lie algebras,* Nucl. Phys. B **496** (1997) 617 [hep-th/9611014].

[18] P. Fre, *Lectures on special Kahler geometry and electric - magnetic duality rotations,* Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **45BC** (1996) 59 [hep-th/9512043].
P. Fre, *Gaugings and other supergravity tools of p-brane physics*, hep-th/0102114.